DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 943 SO 002 043

AUTHOR	Crockett, Walter H.; And Others
TITLE	Teachers As Students: Report on the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, 1967-1968.
INSTITUTION	Consortium of Professional Associations.
PUB DATE	68
NOTE	136p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Improvement; Graduate Study; *Improvement Programs; Inservice Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Master Teachers; Methods Courses; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Schools of Education; Social Sciences; *Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program

ABSTRACT

The Program reported here was designed to help improve the quality of education in the nations elementary and secondary schools. It pursued this goal in two ways: first, by helping selected, potentially influential experienced teache to pursue full-time graduate education in specially planned courses of studies; second, by fostering and strengthening in colleges and universities an increased concern for the training of teachers. Two kinds of data were gathered: 1) responses to questionnaires that were administered at the end of 1967-68 academic year to all of the 1,498 fellows in 70 programs; and 2) data from the intensive study of three selected programs involving teachers of disadvantaged youth, secondary history teachers, and secondary social science teachers. The data are presented in four parts: 1) summary of the results of the study; 2) Backgrounds and educational values and beliefs of the fellows; 3) analysis of perceived effectiveness of the individual programs and the correlates of effectiveness; and, 4) implications for teacher training and for higher education. (Author/AWW)

ED056943

SP002043

TEACHERS AS STUDENTS:

Report on

The Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, 1967-68

By

Walter H. Crockett
Speech Communication and Human Relations
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

James D. Laird
Department of Psychology
Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts

and

Joseph C. Bentley
Department of Educational Psychology
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

Compass

ED056943

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TEACHERS AS STUDENTS:

Report on

The Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, 1967-68

By

Walter H. Crockett
Speech Communication and Human Relations
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

James D. Laird
Department of Psychology
Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts

and

Joseph C. Bentley
Department of Educational Psychology
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

Chapter 1. The Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program 1

Chapter 2. An Overview of the Findings 5

II. Fellows and Staff: Their Backgrounds, Aspirations and Educational Values 12

Chapter 3. Backgrounds of Fellows and Staff 13

A. Characteristics of Fellows 13

B. Characteristics of Faculty 17

Chapter 4. Some General Aspirations, Beliefs, and Values of Fellows and Faculty 21

A. Fellows' Aspirations and Faculty Perception Thereof 21

B. Reasons for Applying to the ExTFP 23

C. Beliefs Concerning the Proper Functions of Teachers 27

D. Evaluation of the Goals of the ExTFP 30

E. Summary 35

III. Perceptions and Evaluations of How the Program Operated 37

Chapter 5. Program Effectiveness and Fellows' Morale 38

A. Effectiveness 38

B. Fellows' Solidarity and Morale 43

C. Summary 48

Chapter 6. Coordination among Components of the Program 49

A. The Extent of Coordination 49

B. Correlations among Measures of Coordination 52

C. Correlations of Program Coordination with Effectiveness and Morale 53

D. Discussion and Summary 54

Chapter 7. Evaluation of Courses and Program Administration 56

A. Evaluation of Courses, Problems, and Relationships between Fellows and Staff 56

B. Correlations among Evaluations of Courses and Reports of Program Administration 65

C. Correlations with Measures of Effectiveness, Morale, and Coordination of Program Components 71

D. Summary 74

Chapter 8. Operating Strategies 76

A. The Nature of the Operating Strategies 76

B. Correlations among Aspects of Operating Strategies 79

C. Correlations of Operating Strategies with Measures of Effectiveness and Morale 81

D. Summary 82

Chapter 9. A Comparison of Education-Based and Noneducation-Based Programs 84

A. Effectiveness and the Location of the Program 84

B. Morale and the Location of the Program 86

C. Program Coordination and Location of the Program 88

D. Evaluation of Courses, Program Administration, and the Location of the Program 89

E. Relationships between Fellows and Staff and the Location of the Program 92

F. Operating Strategy and the Location of the Program 95

G. Summary 96

IV. Some Implications 99

Chapter 10. Fellows' Aspirations and Administrators' Expectations 100

Chapter 11. The Problem of Communication: Misconceptions about Values, Intentions, and Beliefs 103

Chapter 12. The Bad Course 110

Chapter 13. One Victory for the Educationists 115

Chapter 14. On the Administration of Higher Education 122

Chapter 1

The Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program

The Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program (ExTFP) is designed to help improve the quality of education in the nation's elementary and secondary schools. It pursues this goal in two ways: first, by helping selected, potentially influential experienced teachers to pursue full-time graduate education in specially planned courses of studies; second, by fostering and strengthening in colleges and universities an increased concern for the training of teachers. The program was initiated in 1966. It has since been incorporated in the more comprehensive Education Professions Development Act which was authorized by Public Law 90-35, and which became effective July 1, 1968. The present report summarizes the results of a study of the ExTFP in its second year, 1967-68. A similar report on the ExTFP in its first year has already been published.[1]

A. The Development of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program.

The ExTFP was authorized under Title V, Part C of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Guidelines were distributed in December of 1965; by February, 1966, barely two months after the first guidelines were sent out, the announcement of awards were made. The first teachers to begin study under the ExTFP started their work in June, 1966.

Despite the speed with which the program was mounted, almost 1,000 proposals were submitted for the academic year 1966-67. Fifty of these proposals were funded, enabling just over a thousand teachers to enter graduate work. In its second year of operation, 1967-68, approximately 860 proposals were submitted for consideration under the ExTFP. Of these 70 were approved, providing approximately 1,500 fellowships for experienced teachers.

In its underlying assumptions, the conception of the program was broad and inclusive. In the guidelines, no limits were suggested as to the range of subject matter that would be supported; no premium was placed on either innovation or traditionalism in educational procedures, and there was no attempt to specify in detail the structure that the graduate programs should adopt. There was, however, the assumption that graduate education is most effective when the courses a student takes are related to one another in a meaningful fashion. The guidelines for ExTFP proposals incorporated this assumption by setting three restrictions on authors of proposals:

---

[1] Walter H. Crockett, Joseph C. Bentley, and James D. Laird, Report on the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, 1966-67, Washington, D. C.: CONPASS, 1967.

First, evidence was required of more than perfunctory cooperation between subject-matter and teacher-education specialists. All proposals were required to demonstrate that a suitable faculty could be assembled, composed of members of "teacher education" and "non-teacher education" departments. Further, both the chairman or dean for the substantive aspect of the program and the chairman or dean for teacher education were required to sign the proposal before it was submitted.

Second, institutions were required to adopt an en bloc procedure, by designing a program for the entire group of fifteen to thirty fellows, rather than leaving the individual fellows "to the mercy of the catalogue's cafeteria-like offerings, so often unsuited to the needs of experienced personnel." The en bloc mode of organization was also to provide greater visibility of the program on the campus as well as increased opportunity for fellows to profit from interaction with their peers and from formal instruction by their professors.

Third, the guidelines encouraged cooperation between the institution of higher education and the local school district or system. This was fostered in part by the requirement that fellows be selected jointly by their home educational system and by the college or university concerned. School administrators were required to recommend applicants, and applicants were expected to return to the school systems from which they came. In addition, in order to confront the realities of teaching in schools, cooperation was encouraged between colleges and local school systems, to provide a meaningful practicum experience for the participants. These were, of course, only guidelines, and like most guidelines were met only partially in the typical program. The wisdom of the guidelines will become apparent in the course of this report.

The 70 programs that were funded for 1967-68 were held in 57 different colleges and universities located in 31 states. Programs were conducted in widely differing disciplines, ranging from general fields of education (elementary education, teaching the disadvantaged, counseling and guidance) through the traditional liberal arts disciplines, to specialized areas such as educational media, health and physical education, and music and fine arts. The fellows were drawn from every part of the country and from schools which served every economic level; their educational assignments ranged from preschool to high school.

B. Evaluation of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program

1. Three Evaluation Studies.

In the report of the first year of the ExTFP, three studies were outlined as the means for evaluating the effectiveness of the program: first, a questionnaire study of responses to the first year's program, combined with on-site visits to 31 of the 50 programs by teams of specialists; second, a field investigation of the operation of the ExTFP in three different institutions; and, in the third year, another study of the entire set of institutions then operating under the ExTFP. It was planned that each successive investigation would build upon the results obtained by those preceding.

The first of these studies has been completed. Throughout this present report, reference will be made to the results of that study, since they serve as benchmarks for comparing the results of the present investigation.

The plan for the second study, designed originally to be an in-depth investigation of three institutions, was expanded to include, in addition, a questionnaire administered to the fellows and faculty at all institutions where ExTFP programs were in operation. The third investigation, which is now well underway, is an extensive study of all ExTFP programs presently in operation, involving repeated administration of questionnaires throughout the academic year. In addition, supplementary questionnaires will be sent to a representative sample of the fellows in the 1967-68 ExTFP programs inquiring about their post-fellowship experiences in the schools to which they returned.

2. The Procedures Used in the Present Investigation.

The present report is based on two kinds of data: responses to questionnaires that were administered at the end of the 1967-68 academic year to all individuals involved in the program, and data gathered from the intensive study of three selected programs.[2] For the most part, the report will concentrate on responses to the questionnaires, using information from the three intensive studies largely for purposes of illustration.

Three questionnaires were administered to individuals in different roles in the ExTFP. Each questionnaire borrowed heavily from those used in the preceding year. One questionnaire, containing 57 different items, was administered in May, 1968, to the fellows at the institutions they attended, under conditions which assured anonymity.

---

[2] The programs were one for teachers of disadvantaged youth at Northeastern Illinois State College in Chicago; a program for teachers of history in grades 7-12 at the University of Kansas; and a program for teachers of social science, grades 7-12 at Utah State University. We wish to express our deep appreciation to Dr. Donald H. Smith, Dr. Lynn Nelson, and Dr. Douglas D. Alder, directors of the programs at Chicago, Kansas, and Utah State, respectively; to Messrs. D. Stanley Eitzen and W. Nevelle Razak, interviewers at the University of Kansas; to Mr. Edward Dash and Mrs. Carol Checketts, interviewers at Utah State University; to Mr. Andrew H. Gonyea, research assistant and interviewer at Northeastern Illinois State College; and to all the fellows and faculty members who cooperated so graciously with the investigators.

Completed questionnaires were obtained from 1,365 of the 1,498 fellows, representing 68 of the 70 programs in operation.[3]

The director at each institution was asked to supply the names of the full-time and part-time staff of his program. A second questionnaire, about equal in length to the student questionnaire, was mailed in May, 1968, to faculty members on each campus. Of 280 questionnaires distributed, 224 were returned. A third questionnaire, also sent in May, 1968, went to the directors and co-directors at each institution. It was identical to the faculty questionnaire. Of the 77 directors and co-directors, 62 returned completed questionnaires.

These, then, are the observations on which this report is based. The report, itself, comes in four parts. The introduction consists of the present chapter and the one succeeding, in which the results of the study will be summarized. Part II presents information concerning the backgrounds and the educational values and beliefs of the ExTFP fellows. Part III provides an analysis of the perceived effectiveness of the individual programs and of the correlates of effectiveness. Finally, in Part IV we will consider some of the implications of these results for teacher training and for higher education in general. Since each of these sections has its own short introduction, we need not discuss further the organization of the report; instead, let us proceed to a short summary of the results of this research.

---

[3] Questionnaires were not received from a program in modern foreign languages at the University of Arkansas. In addition, the program at Rutgers University was a three-year program with participants who were at different stages in the program; it seemed sufficiently different from the other programs that data collected at Rutgers were not used for this report.

We are extremely grateful to the directors of the 68 programs for their cooperation in distributing, collecting, and returning to us the questionnaires that their fellows filled out. Our thanks, also, to the fellows, faculty members, and directors who took the time to reply to these questionnaires.

Chapter 2

An Overview of the Findings

The purpose of the present chapter is to summarize the findings in the 1967-68 study, findings which will be presented in detail in subsequent chapters. Because the details of the results are presented in Parts II and III of this report, the summary will be a brief one, without tables and supporting figures; because Part IV of this report discusses some of the more general implications of the study, we shall not dwell on such implications in the present chapter.

A. Backgrounds and Abilities of Fellows and Faculty Members

As was true in the 1966-67 study, the fellows who took part in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program were relatively young and predominantly male; they represented all academic levels from preschool through high school and all parts of the country. They appear to have been an exceptional group, in view of the high grades they earned and very favorable judgments they received from faculty members and directors in the various programs. That they were also highly motivated is attested by their long-range aspirations, which will be discussed below, and by the fact that 80% of them had already enrolled for graduate work prior to their acceptance in the ExTFP.

The educational attainments and experience of the faculty who taught in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program suggest that they, also, were unusually well qualified. Thus, as was reported for the 1966-67 study, "the great majority of the ExTFP programs possessed the two principal qualifications for an effective academic program: an able, highly motivated student body and a capable, concerned faculty."

B. Aspirations and Values

1. Most ExTFP fellows had aspirations to move out of the elementary and secondary school classroom within the foreseeable future; their most popular goal was junior college or college teaching.

Fellows were asked to report the kinds of positions they would like to be filling (a) within the next two years, and (b) in the next five to ten years. Most fellows expected to be in positions similar to their present ones for the short run. However, only about a fourth of the fellows hoped to be teaching in elementary and secondary schools in ten years time. Another fourth expected to be serving as educational specialists, most of them, presumably, in elementary and secondary schools. The most popular long-range aspiration for the rest of the fellows, chosen by about a third of the total group, was teaching in a junior college or in a four-year college.

The nature of these aspirations was doubtless much different from those envisioned by the designers of the ExTFP; the aspirations were not recognized by the faculty and staff of the ExTFP either, for 80% to 90% of them estimated that most fellows would continue to be employed in their present positions or similar ones during the next five to ten years.

2. In reporting on their own educational values and beliefs, respondents favored those associated with "modern" trends in education; they attributed "traditional" values and beliefs to those in complementary roles.

Fellows, faculty members, and directors were asked to place a number of different functions of teachers in rank order, according to respondents' opinions of their importance. Very similar patterns of judgments were shown by respondents in the three different roles. They felt that teachers should be most concerned to stimulate creativity and to encourage a questioning attitude among their students. The function of transmitting knowledge was not ranked higher than third in any group. However, in predicting the responses of those in the other group, respondents consistently overestimated the popularity of communicating specific subject matter and underestimated the popularity of stimulating creativity and a questioning attitude toward one's studies and the world.

Similarly, in predicting the judgments of those in the other role about the goals that ExTFP programs should properly pursue, respondents consistently overestimated others' commitment to the transmission of specific knowledge and consistently underestimated their concern with coming to understand students' behavior and with learning what is most important to teach. Respondents in all three roles also reported that the transmission of knowledge was the goal best accomplished by the ExTFP program.

C. Judgments and Correlates of Effectiveness

1. Evaluations of the ExTFP were overwhelmingly favorable.

As was true in the 1966-67 study, the extent of a source's enthusiasm about the ExTFP varied with that source's degree of professional involvement: directors' judgments of effectiveness were more favorable than those given by faculty members, and those by faculty members were more favorable than judgments by fellows. Fellows in the present study made slightly less favorable judgments of program effectiveness than did those in the 1966-67 programs, while the faculty and directors made slightly more favorable judgments than did those of the preceding year. But these differences among groups of respondents from one year to the next occurred within a context in which most respondents judged that their programs were very effective, indeed. Thus, among fellows in the present study (the least enthusiastic of the 6 groups) 76% reported either that their program was usually stimulating and interesting or that it was stimulating and interesting throughout;

79% reported that it was moderately or extremely useful in preparing them for their own teaching; and 67% reported that they learned a great deal, while another 29% said they learned a moderate amount.

There was, of course, considerable variation from one institution to another in the evaluations that were made of program effectiveness. As might be expected, the average responses to the five items dealing with program effectiveness were very highly correlated across the 68 institutions. Those programs which were evaluated as effective on one item tended also to be evaluated favorably on the other items.

2. Fellows in programs that were based in schools or departments of education made consistently more favorable judgments of effectiveness than did fellows whose programs were based in other academic locations.

This difference between education-based and noneducation-based programs also characterized fellows' reports on a variety of other topics, as we shall see, with those in education-based programs consistently making more favorable judgments of their program than those in noneducation programs.

3. Respondents reported a high degree of morale and solidarity among fellows.

Fellows in the present study made slightly lower estimates of group solidarity and morale than did those in the 1966-67 study, while faculty members and directors reported much higher levels of morale and solidarity among the fellows than did their counterparts of the previous year. As was true for judgments of effectiveness, the average judgments of even the least enthusiastic groups reflected quite a high level of morale and reports of considerable group solidarity. On all four of the items that dealt with morale and solidarity, fellows in education-based programs made more positive reports than those in noneducation programs.

In education and noneducation programs, alike, there was a strong positive correlation between fellows' reports of morale and judgments by fellows and faculty members of program effectivness, a result which was also obtained in the 1966-67 study. Reports of group solidarity also correlated significantly with effectiveness in education-based programs but not in noneducation programs.

4. Fellows and faculty members disagreed as to whether their programs built upon the extensive backgrounds of fellows and in their reports of coordination among program components, though they did agree concerning whether subject matter was emphasized more than teaching methods. Fellows responses to these items correlated consistently with ratings of effectiveness by both fellows and faculty members.

In their judgments of how well the parts of their program were coordinated to one another, directors were more favorable than faculty members who were more favorable than fellows, of whom 55% to 60% reported either that the parts were quite well coordinated or very well coordinated. These judgments by fellows in the present study were somewhat more favorable than those by fellows in the 1966-67 study. Fellows in education-based programs gave significantly more favorable responses than those in non-education programs. In both education-based and noneducation-based programs, fellows' judgments of program coordination were correlated with ratings of effectiveness, while faculty judgments on these items did not correlate with effectiveness.

As to judgments of whether the programs built on their participants' backgrounds, 97% of the directors reported that they usually or consistently did so, a judgment with which 74% of the faculty, 57% of the fellows, and 63% of the fellows in 1966-67 concurred. Fellows in education-based programs reported significantly more of such coordination with fellows' backgrounds than did those in noneducation programs. In education-based programs, fellows' reports on this item were very highly correlated with their judgments of program success. The same relationship did not hold in non-education programs or with respect to faculty judgments on this item.

There was a consistent decrease from fellows to faculty members to program directors in the proportion of respondents who said their program emphasized subject matter more than it emphasized teaching methods; conversely, there was a consistent increase from one of these groups to the next in the proportion who reported a satisfactory balance between subject matter and teaching methods. Fellows in noneducation-based programs were significantly more likely than those in education-based programs to report that subject matter was emphasized at the expense of teaching methods. In education-based programs there was a significant inverse relationship between such judgments and ratings of effectiveness; this relationship did not achieve significance in noneducation programs.

5. The amount of work assigned was heavy and the level of competition among fellows was quite high. Neither of these measures correlated significantly with ratings of effectiveness; however, fellows' perceptions of the effects of the competition did correlate with effectiveness.

No more than two percent of the respondents in any of the three roles reported that the fellows' work load was too light, while the proportion reporting that it was too heavy ranged from 62% among the fellows to about 40% for the faculty and directors. Fellows in education-based programs reported that their work load was somewhat less excessive than did those in noneducation programs. Contrary to the results of the 1966-67 study, in neither education-based nor noneducation-based programs did judgments of the amount of work required correlate significantly with rated effectiveness.

As to the level of competition, about half of the fellows reported that it was either quite high or extremely high, compared to about 40% of the faculty and directors and to 60% of the fellows in the 1967-68 program. Education-based and noneducation-based programs did not differ in the level of competition they reported; in education-based, but not in noneducation-based, programs the level of competition correlated significantly with ratings of effectiveness. In both types of programs, fellows' perceptions of the effects of competition did correlate significantly with judgments of effectiveness: fellows who reported that the effects of competition were disruptive were in programs that were judged to be relatively ineffective, while those who reported that the effects of competition were to push fellows to greater effors were in programs that were adjudged relatively effective.

6. Fellows and faculty members were in disagreement as to the amount of innovativeness in their programs; fellows' ratings of innovativeness correlated significantly with their judgments of effectiveness.

Only two thirds of the fellows, and about 95% of the faculty and directors, reported that their program was either somewhat innovative or innovative throughout, a result comparable to the findings in the 1966-67 study. Contrary to the findings in the earlier study, fellows' ratings of innovativeness correlated quite strongly with their judgments of effectiveness.

7. Not surprisingly, there was a strong positive relationship between fellows' reports of the quality of their courses and ratings of program effectiveness.

In the main, fellows' ratings of the quality of their courses were very favorable. They reported that their best courses were extremely good, and most fellows said the majority of their courses were nearer in quality to their best one than to their worst one. Nevertheless, over half of the respondents reported that at least one course was extremely ineffective, a condition we think characterizes the experience of the majority of students in American colleges and universities today. Fellows in education-based programs gave more favorable ratings to their best and their worst courses than did those in noneducation programs. In both types of programs, fellows' judgments of the quality of their courses correlated very strongly with ratings of program effectiveness.

8. Judgments of effectiveness of the ExTFP were closely related to the kinds of actions that were taken to alleviate problems in the programs and also to the kinds of relationships that were established between fellows and staff members.

Respondents were asked an extensive series of questions about the extent of problems in their programs, about how these problems were handled, and about the relationships that were established between fellows and staff members. Fellows reports of the seriousness of problems in their programs spanned the range of possible answers from "not serious at all" to "extremely serious." On the one hand, 39% of the fellows reported that such problems interfered only slightly or not at all with their program's effectiveness, on the other hand, 36% said that they interfered moderately or extremely with program effectiveness. Fellows in education-based programs reported that such problems were less serious than did those in noneducation programs. As might be expected, faculty members and program directors were much less likely than were the fellows to report that their programs were plagued by serious problems. In both education-based and noneducation-based programs, fellows' reports that the faculty and, especially, the director attempted to resolve problems which arose, and that they were successful in doing so, were very highly correlated with judgments of effectiveness.

By a margin of more than two to one, fellows reported that their relationship with the faculty in their program was more nearly that of teacher-student than that of colleague-colleague. Fellows in noneducation-based programs reported their relationships to be more clearly structured as teacher-student than did those in education-based programs. Within this highly structured social system, the great majority of fellows--education-based and noneducation-based alike--reported that the faculty and directors were accessible to the fellows, interested in them, and helpful to them. As might be expected, programs whose fellows reported that their relationships to faculty members and to the program director were close and supportive were also programs that were adjudged to be high in effectiveness and to have few serious problems.

It is important to recognize the role of the program director in these matters. Complaints about courses, inquiries about ambiguous policies or requirements, as well as questions and requests from faculty and students alike arrive at his desk for disposition. The actions he takes or fails to take may determine whether a potentially disruptive problem is resolved quietly and expeditiously or comes to interfere seriously with the operation of the program. The director frequently sets the pattern for the kinds of relationships that will develop between fellows and staff members; his actions and decisions have a direct and lasting effect upon the fellows' responses to the program as a whole. It should be clear, then, that the satisfactory performance of this role can be critically important to the program's success.

9. Programs which actually implemented the requirements of the ExTFP guidelines were adjudged to be more successful than those which did not.

As we have pointed out in Chapter 1, only three requirements were built into the initial guidelines: (1) cooperation between subject-matter and teacher education specialists was insisted upon, (2) programs were required to have a core of courses which fellows took as a group, thereby building morale and solidarity among the fellows, and (3) institutions were asked to design their programs so as to use the background of these experienced teachers and to help the teachers maintain contact with their former schools and with schools in their local community. Apparently, not every institution met these requirements. Forty percent of the fellows and 25% of the faculty and directors reported that the material from different departments did not fit together well. Similarly, 40% of the fellows, and 13% of the faculty said the program rarely or never made use of the fellows' backgrounds. However, only about 20% of the fellows reported that group solidarity and morale were low. As to the maintenance of contact with the fellows' previous school system, apparently no more than a handful of institutions effectively fostered such relationships.

The wisdom of including these requirements in the guidelines is evident in the pattern of correlations with judgments of effectiveness. Programs which were said to have close interdepartmental cooperation, those in which the fellows' previous experience was reported to be of use in the conduct of the program, and those whose fellows reported generally high morale were also those which were adjudged to be relatively effective.

II. Fellows and Staff: Their Backgrounds, Aspirations, and Educational Values

In Chapter 3 of this section, the backgrounds of fellows and staff members in the ExTFP will be presented at some length. This material includes both demographic information--their age, education, experience, and the location of the communities from which fellows entered the program--and information concerning the fellows' ability and interests. Throughout this chapter, the findings from the 1967-68 study will be compared with those from the preceding year.

Chapter 4 presents material which was not included in the study of the 1966-67 ExTFP. This material includes fellows' expectations about their long-range career patterns, and the perceptions that faculty members held concerning those careers. In addition, fellows and staff members reported on their own beliefs about the proper functions of teachers, their views about the proper goals of the ExTFP, and their judgments about which goals were best accomplished in their program. For each of these items, respondents in one role were asked to predict the most common responses of the individuals in their own program who filled the complementary roles. As we shall see, there were consistent differences between the positions which respondents actually took and the predictions that were made by respondents in the complementary roles. Some of the implications of these differences will be discussed at length in Section IV of this report.

Chapter 3

Backgrounds of Fellows and Staff

A. Characteristics of the Fellows

1. Personal Characteristics

As was true in the 1966-67 programs, the fellows were probably not representative of teachers as a whole with respect to age and sex. Over 59% of the fellows were men, compared to about 51% in 1966-67. Thirty percent were 29 years old or younger, and an additional 46% were between 30 and 39; thus, just over three fourths of the fellows were under 40, a figure remarkably close to that from 1966-67.

Table 3-1. Age of Fellows

	Year	
	1966-67	1967-68
20-29	28.2	30.0
30-39	51.1	46.0
40-49	16.1	20.0
50-59	3.9	3.8
60 and over	.1	0.0
No Response	.6	.2

Table 3-2. Sex of Fellows

	Year	
	1966-67	1967-68
Male	51.3	59.3
Female	48.5	40.7
No Response	.3	0.0

The fellows were experienced teachers, but not uncommonly experienced ones. About 92% had spent three or more years in the field of education; however, only 26% had worked in education more than 10 years, and a bare 2% had spent over 20 years in the field. These figures are virtually identical to those from 1966-67. As to the school level at which they had taught, about 40% were high school teachers (8% more than in 1966-67), 19% taught in junior high school, 34% taught at the elementary level (8% fewer than in 1966-67), and 4% taught preschool or kindergarten classes.

Table 3-3. Years in Education

	1966-67	1967-68
Less than 3	8.4	8.5
3-5	32.8	31.3
6-10	34.6	33.9
11-20	20.7	23.9
21-25	1.9	1.2
Over 26	1.4	1.1
No Response	0.0	.2

Table 3-4. School Level at Which Fellows Taught

	1966-67	1967-68
Preschool and kinder.	2.6	3.7
Elementary	42.3	34.1
Junior High	20.9	19.4
High School	32.4	40.2
Other	1.7	2.4
No Response	.2	.2

It would be expected that fellows' experience in the special fields of their program would not be extensive--otherwise they would not have been so likely to seek intensive training in their fields. In fact, about 46% had not worked as a specialist in their program's subject matter, and 75% had taught fewer than five years in that subject matter. Again, 42% reported fewer than 10 hours of undergraduate credit in their specialty, and only one in four had more than 30 undergraduate credits in the field, the presumed equivalent of an undergraduate major. It should be noted that the ExTFP was not serving to sharpen skills that were already possessed by those fellows--42% of the total group--who had little or no training or experience in the field of their program. For such individuals, primary training was provided. Thus, to a considerable extent the function served by the ExTFP was different from that of other programs, such as summer institutes, which are largely directed at improving fellows' proficiency at previously-acquired skills.

Despite their rather brief experience in their specialties, the seriousness of purpose of the fellows is revealed by their pursuit of graduate work in their own or some other specialty: only 20% reported no graduate credit at all, while 50% had taken more than 10 hours of graduate credit. Where comparable questions were asked in 1966-67, the figures for the two groups are not remarkably different.

Table 3-5. Background and Training of Fellows

Years as Specialist in Field of ExTFP (1967-68 only)		Hours of Undergraduate Credit in Field of ExTFP			Total Hours of Graduate Credit (1967-68 only)	
			1966-67	1967-68		
None	46.0	Under 10	37.4	41.8	None	20.4
1-2	14.4	10-20	19.2	16.2	1-10	29.6
3-4	14.2	21-30	14.6	14.1	11-20	18.3
5-10	18.8	31-40	11.2	11.1	21-30	10.0
Over 10	6.3	Over 40	17.0	15.9	Over 30	21.3
No Response	.4	No Response	.5	.9	No Response	.4

2. Home Communities of Participants

The home communities of the fellows were also quite varied. As was true in 1966-67, there were a few (about 5%) who taught in schools with fewer than 200 students and a few more (about 9%) who taught in schools with over 2,000, while the majority of the fellows were distributed across schools whose size varied within these limits. Similarly, fellows came from small or large communities in about the same proportion as last year, and approximately according to the distribution of the general population in such communities. Again, the distribution of ethnic backgrounds of students in the fellows' home schools was about the same as in 1966-67: about 70% of the teachers came from schools where all or most of the students were white, about 13% from schools where all or most of the students were Negro, and most of the rest from schools with mixed ethnic backgrounds.

Table 3-6. Enrollment in Home School

	1966-67	1967-68
Under 200	3.7	4.6
200-400	11.5	12.2
401-600	18.2	18.1
601-900	21.5	18.5
901-1,200	16.1	14.3
1,201-2,000	17.0	20.2
Over 2,000	8.7	8.6
Other	3.1	3.5
No Response	.2	.2

Table 3-7. Size of Home Community

	1966-67	1967-68
Over 500,000	18.6	15.9
200,000-500,000	9.4	7.7
Suburb to city	14.3	11.4
100,000-200,000	7.2	7.8
25,000-100,000	17.2	17.2
2,500-25,000	22.8	27.4
Under 2,500	9.9	11.6
No Response	.5	.4

Table 3-8. Ethnic Background of Students in Fellows' Schools

	1966-67	1967-68
All or most white	68.5	69.7
All or most Spanish	3.8	2.0
All or most Indian	.3	.6
All or most Negro	11.7	12.6
Combination of 2	7.6	7.9
Combination of 3	2.5	2.4
Other	5.2	4.5
No Response	.4	.3

Table 3-9. Regional Location of School

	1966-67	1967-68
Northeast	23.2	27.4
Southeast	6.9	11.9
South Central	4.9	6.8
Southwest	7.2	5.4
Midwest	32.6	24.8
West	24.3	22.8
Outside U.S.	.9	.5
No Response	0.0	.4

The only substantial difference between the backgrounds of 1967-68 ExTFP fellows and those of fellows from the previous year was in the regional location of their home schools. A higher proportion came from schools in the South (24% as against 19%), and especially from the Southeastern and South Central states; a higher proportion came from the Northeast (27% as against 23%); a lower proportion originated in the Middle West (25% as against 33%); and about the same proportion came from the West (around 24% in both years). This slight shift in the fellows' regional origin meant that this year's group was more representative than last year's of the geographic distribution of the national population.

3. Fellows' Abilities and Interests

The general strongly positive evaluation of fellows' abilities which characterized the 1966-67 responses was observed once again in the replies to the 1967-68 questionnaire. Indeed, on at least one item, the evaluation given to the 1967-68 group was higher than that of the previous year. Thus, the faculty and directors were asked in both years to compare the level of ability of ExTFP participants to that of other graduate students in the same fields. (The same question was asked of fellows in 1967-68, but not in the preceding year.) Just over half of the 1967-68 directors, compared to 29% of those in 1966-67, reported that fellows' ability was slightly higher or much higher than that of other graduate students in their field. Thirty-nine percent of the faculty members in 1967-68, compared to 24% the preceding year, said the fellows were of slightly or much higher ability than graduate students, a 15% difference in favor of the 1967-68 group; both years just 28% of the faculty rated the graduate students higher than the fellows. Among the fellows, just over half reported that their group was superior to the school's other graduate students in their field, while only 10% reported that the other graduate students were superior in some degree.

Table 3-10. Ratings of Level of Ability of ExTFP Fellows Relative to Graduate Students in the Same Field

	Fellows 1967-68	Faculty 1966-67	Faculty 1967-68	Director 1966-67	Director 1967-68
Much higher	17.8	4.3	11.6	8.9	12.7
Slightly higher	32.4	19.8	27.2	20.0	38.1
About the same	38.6	45.5	32.6	55.6	23.8
Slightly lower	7.7	22.5	22.3	11.1	19.0
Much lower	2.1	5.3	5.8	2.2	3.2
No Response	1.3	2.5	.4	2.2	3.2

A second question concerning fellows' ability simply requested respondents to rate the general level of ability of fellows. It was asked of the fellows in both years and of the faculty and directors only in 1967-68. A comparison of fellows' responses the two different years shows that reports of outstanding ability were somewhat less frequent in 1967-68 than the preceding year (26% as against 33%), while judgments that fellows' ability was high but not outstanding were more frequent (56% compared to 50%). Nevertheless, in both years just over 80% of the fellows reported that their group's ability was high or outstanding. A similar report was made in 1967-68 by 71% of the faculty and by 76% of the directors. It should be noted that in no group did any substantial number of respondents report that fellows' ability was below average.

Table 3-11. Judgments of the General Level of Ability of Fellows

	Fellows 1966-67	Fellows 1967-68	Faculty 1967-68	Directors 1967-68
Outstanding	33.0	25.5	21.4	22.2
High, but not outstanding	50.4	56.2	49.6	54.0
About average	15.3	16.9	24.6	22.2
Somewhat lower than average	.8	1.1	3.1	0.0
Very low	.1	.1	0.0	0.0
No Response	.4	.2	1.3	1.6

One trend, which was also found in the 1966-67 study, should be noted in the preceding tables: the proportion of favorable responses by a group varied directly with that group's investment in the issue. Thus, fellows, who belonged to the group that was being rated, gave more favorable evaluations of their ability than did individuals in the other two groups. Similarly, directors, who had some sort of personal responsibility for the ExTFP, made more favorable judgments than did faculty members in general. Nevertheless, the fact that the great majority of all three groups, even the faculty, made very positive judgments of fellows' ability strongly suggests that the fellows who took part in the ExTFP constituted a very capable group of students. This generalization was also supported by the observations that were made in the three institutions whose programs were studied intensively. In all three institutions, any differences between course grades earned by ExTFP fellows and those of graduate students at a comparable level were in favor of the fellows. As a group, then, ExTFP fellows were able and diligent students whose performance, even in competition with advanced graduate students, was consistently good, not infrequently excellent, and rarely, if ever, poor.

B. Characteristics of the Faculty

To the extent that advanced degrees are indicative of educational qualifications, the staff of the 1967-68 ExTFP appears to have been highly qualified. Eighty-three percent of the faculty, exclusive of the director, held either the Ph.D. (58%) or the Ed.D. (25%) degree; the total percentage was up from 73% in 1966-67. An even larger proportion, 95%, of program directors held the doctorate. In both years, faculty members new to college teaching were involved in ExTFP programs in about the same proportion as teachers with moderate or long tenure in teaching. In both years, also, program directors had considerably more experience at the college level than did the other faculty members; about a third of the directors had over 15 years of college experience.

Table 3-12. Last Earned Degree

	Faculty		Director	
	1966-67	1967-68	1966-67	1967-68
A.B.	3.2	.4	0.0	0.0
M.A.	19.3	15.2	6.7	4.8
Ph.D.	54.5	58.0	55.6	65.1
Ed.D.	18.2	25.4	37.8	30.2
Other	4.8	.4	0.0	0.0
No Response	0.0	.4	0.0	0.0

Table 3-13. Years in College Teaching

	Faculty		Director	
	1966-67	1967-68	1966-67	1967-68
1-2	19.3	17.4	0.0	3.2
3-5	19.8	24.6	20.0	20.6
6-10	19.8	21.4	26.7	23.8
11-15	8.6	12.5	15.6	17.1
Over 16	25.1	22.3	35.6	31.7
No Response	7.5	1.8	2.2	1.6

In age, faculty members were older, on the average, than fellows; nearly three fourths of the faculty fell between the ages of 30 and 49. Directors, in turn, were older on the average than faculty members. The only noticeable change from 1966-67 to 1967-68 in the age distribution of the staff was the rather sharp increase in the proportion of directors who were in their thirties, and a corresponding decrease of the proportion in their forties.

The overwhelming majority of faculty and directors were men, 84% and 90%, respectively. The proportion of women in both roles declined sharply from 1966-67 to 1967-68. It was not possible to determine whether this resulted from a shift in the content of the programs that were supported to fields not as often populated by women, or from some other factor that operated in a similar manner over a variety of academic institutions.

Table 3-14. Age of Staff Members

	Faculty		Director	
	1966-67	1967-68	1966-67	1967-68
20-29	7.5	5.8	0.0	0.0
30-39	38.5	38.8	24.4	33.3
40-49	34.8	33.9	44.4	36.5
50-59	15.0	16.1	22.2	22.2
Over 60	4.3	4.5	8.9	7.9
No Response	0.0	.9	0.0	0.0

Table 3-15. Sex of Staff Members

	Faculty		Director	
	1966-67	1967-68	1966-67	1967-68
Male	75.9	84.4	84.4	90.5
Female	24.1	15.2	11.1	9.5
No Response	0.0	.4	4.4	0.0

As to their experience in teaching at other levels than college--experience which might be expected to be relevant to the instruction of experienced teachers--two thirds of the faculty and three fourths of the directors reported at least some experience at the elementary or secondary levels. However, this experience was not extensive: no more than a third of either group had taught longer than five years in elementary or secondary schools.

Table 3-16. Years in Elementary or Secondary School Teaching

	Faculty	Director
None	37.0	25.4
1-2	13.8	9.5
3-5	17.9	31.7
6-10	17.4	20.6
11-15	8.5	7.9
Over 16	3.1	4.8
No Response	2.2	0.0

C. Summary

As to the nature of the fellows, one derives the picture of a young, intelligent, energetic group, highly motivated to learn and capable of performing at a consistently high level. The faculty and directors also appear to have been well qualified, with considerable experience in teaching at the college level and, in about two cases out of three at least some experience in elementary or secondary school teaching.

Not only do these results suggest that the typical program provided a stimulating educational environment, but they also indicate that the ExTFP--however distinctive it may be in some ways--represents a sample of top-quality graduate education in America. Thus, much of what this study will disclose about the ExTFP should be relevant to the operation of graduate education in general.

Chapter 4

Some General Aspirations, Beliefs, and Values of Fellows and Faculty

One of the principal departures of the 1967-68 survey from the one of the year preceding was the inclusion of a set of questions which dealt with more general issues than the evaluation of individual programs. In the present chapter we discuss questions which asked about (a) the aspirations of fellows, and the perceptions faculty members held of fellows' aspirations, (b) the motives of fellows in applying to the ExTFP, (c) the attitudes of fellows and faculty members concerning the functions of teachers, and (d) respondents' views about the proper goals of the ExTFP.

A. Fellows' Aspirations and Faculty Perceptions Thereof

The first interviews in the three programs that were studied intensively made it clear that a considerable number of fellows did not expect to spend the rest of their careers as classroom teachers and even more were undecided as to how long they would remain in the classroom. This is not to say that fellows were unhappy with teaching. On the contrary, most of them were happy that they had chosen education as a field; almost all of them expected to remain in their schools for the short run. Instead of dissatisfaction with teaching, the aspiration of many fellows to move out of teaching at the elementary or secondary school level seemed to reflect at least two kinds of reactions: first, a feeling, especially among men, that such teaching did not carry sufficient social and other rewards to justify a lifetime in the classroom; second, a desire for a kind of teaching experience or a degree of educational influence that is not ordinarily available in the elementary or secondary school classroom.

To determine whether the same aspirations characterized the entire group of ExTFP fellows, one item was included in the final questionnaire which presented respondents with fourteen different occupations and asked them to pick the three they most aspired to. In order to distinguish between short- and long-range aspirations, fellows were asked, first, to rank in order of likelihood the three occupations to which they expected to be devoting the majority of their time two years from now. Following that, they ranked the three professional activities they would most desire to be performing in five to ten years.

Responses by the fellows as a group were clearly consistent with those given in the three institutions that were studied intensively. Exactly half of the fellows reported that their most likely occupation two years hence was that of classroom teacher in their present school, classroom teacher in a better school, or department chairman--a position which typically carries responsibility for curriculum planning, yet involves a major commitment to classroom teaching. Another fourth of the fellows expected in two years to be employed as educational specialists, i.e., as guidance counsellors, special teachers, or curriculum planners--presumably operating, for the most part, on the elementary or secondary level. Fewer than 20% of the fellows expected to be administrators or college teachers in two years.

Table 4-1. Fellows' Short- and Long-Range Career Aspirations

	2 Years from Now			5-10 Years from Now		
Occupation	% 1st Choice	% 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice
a. Regular classroom teacher in present school	29.3	14.8	44.1	9.2	14.8	24.0
b. Regular classroom teacher in better school	12.9	18.5	31.4	5.7	13.8	19.5
c. Department chairman	8.3	23.4	31.7	8.9	18.0	26.9
d. Principal or school superintendent	4.3	8.3	12.6	8.4	10.6	19.0
e. Admin. position in state dept. of Educ. or federal Office of Ed.	1.6	5.4	7.0	4.8	13.5	18.3
f. Junior College teacher	4.5	16.8	21.3	9.7	18.1	27.8
g. Department of Educ. on college level	3.4	12.3	15.7	14.6	17.2	31.8
h. Non-Educ. department on college level	1.7	3.7	5.4	6.3	6.4	12.7
i. Graduate work for advanced degree	6.4	27.7	34.1	3.7	14.4	18.1
j. Curriculum development work	10.0	32.2	42.2	12.1	30.8	42.9
k. Work for private industry--publishing, teach. mach., audio vis.	.3	4.0	4.3	.9	6.3	7.2
l. Special tchg., e.g. speech ther., remed. read., adjustment, etc.	8.9	12.5	21.4	5.9	13.1	19.0
m. Guidance work	5.4	4.6	10.0	5.3	4.9	10.2
n. Other	2.3	3.5	5.8	3.0	2.3	5.3
o. No Response	.7	12.0	12.7	1.3	15.7	17.0
Total,classroom teacher (a, b, c above)	50.0	56.7	107.2	23.8	46.6	70.4
Total, administration (d, e above)	5.9	13.7	19.6	13.2	24.1	37.3
Total, higher education (f, g, h above)	9.6	32.8	42.4	30.6	41.7	72.3
Total, Educ. specialist (j, k, l, m above)	24.6	53.3	77.9	24.2	55.1	79.3

Fellows' long-range aspirations were considerably different from their short-run expectations. The most popular long-range aspiration was to teach at a more advanced level, in junior college or college, with just over 30% of the fellows picking one of these three alternatives as their first choice. Slightly less than a fourth of the respondents hoped to continue as classroom teachers in five to ten years, and a nearly identical proportion hoped to be educational specialists. Thus, just under 50% of the fellows expressed a desire to remain in elementary or secondary education, either in the classroom or as a specialist; it is especially interesting that fewer than a tenth of the fellows hoped to be teaching in their present schools in five to ten years. Only about 13% of the fellows reported that their long-range goal involved some form of educational administration.

The expectations which faculty members held of the fellows' long-range career patterns were quite different from the above, as may be seen in Table 4-2. Staff members were asked to rank the three occupations they thought the largest number of fellows would be involved in, both two years and five-to-ten years hence. There was little evidence that they recognized their students' leaning toward educational occupations outside the classroom. Thus, 60% of both faculty and directors expected that most fellows would be involved in classroom teaching in five to ten years, while the next most common expectation was for fellows to be engaged in one or another educational specialty. One of these two categories--classroom teacher and educational specialist--was chosen by 82% of the faculty and 89% of the directors as the most likely occupation of most fellows in five to ten years. Note, however, that the staff did recognize the competence and ambition of the fellows. They revealed that awareness in their estimates of the proportion who would move to better positions as classroom teachers or department chairmen; only 11% of the faculty and 6% of the directors expected that most fellows would be classroom teachers in their present schools five to ten years hence. Nevertheless, fewer than 10% of either the faculty or the directors expected fellows to be teaching in junior colleges or four-year colleges in five to ten years--the most common aspiration of the fellows.

Clearly, there was a marked tendency for fellows to look forward to leaving the elementary or secondary school, an outcome of the ExTFP which probably was not envisioned either by the Office of Education or by the institutions which conducted individual programs. In the last section of this report, the implications of these results will be discussed at some length.

B. Reasons for Applying to the ExTFP

Fellows were provided with a list of reasons people had given as affecting their decisions to apply to the ExTFP; they were asked to select, in order, the three which had been most influential in their own decisions. Over three fourths of the fellows gave as their first choice one of three alternatives: the chance to obtain an M.A. degree, the opportunity to learn more about the subject matter, and the possibility of learning more

Table 4-2. Faculty and Directors' Predictions of Short- and Long-Range Career Choices of Fellows

	2 Years from Now				5-10 Years from Now			
	Faculty		Directors		Faculty		Directors	
Occupation	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice
a. Regular classroom teacher in present school	33.9	54.4	27.0	46.1	11.2	30.4	6.3	22.2
b. Regular classroom teacher in better school	29.9	63.4	25.4	57.1	28.1	57.1	28.6	50.8
c. Department chairman	7.6	33.9	14.3	50.8	20.1	46.9	25.4	57.1
d. Principal or school superintendent	.9	13.0	1.6	12.7	5.8	22.3	3.2	19.1
e. Admin. position in state dept. of Ed. or federal Office of Ed.	0.0	5.8	0.0	1.6	1.8	8.5	0.0	7.9
f. Junior college teacher	.4	12.4	0.0	6.3	1.3	17.4	0.0	11.1
g. Department of Ed. on college level	.9	6.7	1.6	11.1	2.7	17.0	6.3	28.5
h. Non-Educ. depart. on college level	.4	1.3	0.0	7.9	.4	4.8	0.0	11.1
i. Graduate work for advanced degree	1.3	30.3	0.0	33.3	1.8	14.3	0.0	15.8
j. Curriculum development work	8.5	38.4	11.1	39.7	9.4	34.8	17.5	42.9
k. Work for private industry--publishing, tchg. machines, audio vis., etc.	0.0	.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0
l. Special tchg., e.g. speech ther., remed. read., adjustment, etc.	5.8	15.6	9.5	12.7	6.2	15.6	4.8	11.2
m. Guidance work	7.1	9.3	6.3	11.1	6.2	10.7	6.3	11.1
n. Other	.9	3.1	3.2	4.8	1.3	3.0	1.6	4.8
o. No Response	2.2	11.1	0.0	4.8	3.6	15.2	0.0	6.3

Table 4-2. Faculty and Directors' Predictions of Short- and Long-Range Career Choices of Fellows (continued)

Occupation	2 Years from Now				5-10 Years from Now			
	Faculty		Directors		Faculty		Directors	
	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice
Total, classroom teacher (a, b, c above)	71.4	151.7	66.7	154.0	59.4	134.4	60.3	130.1
Total, administration (d, e above)	.9	18.8	1.6	14.3	7.6	30.8	3.2	27.0
Total, higher education (f, g, h above)	1.7	20.4	1.6	25.3	4.4	39.2	6.3	50.7
Total, education specialist (j, k, l, m above)	21.4	64.2	26.9	63.5	21.8	62.9	28.6	65.2

effective teaching techniques. These same three alternatives were each chosen by about 60% of the respondents as one of the three most important factors in their decisions. Of the remaining alternatives, the most frequently chosen was the possibility of increased professional mobility, with 40% of the respondents picking this as one of the three most important factors in their decisions.

In examining these reasons, one notes that the two which reflect traditionally academic motives--i.e. learning about the subject matter and learning more effective teaching techniques--were chosen as most important by almost exactly half of the respondents; the other half considered some nonacademic motive to be more important. Among these nonacademic motives, the one most commonly chosen--the chance to obtain an M.A. degree-bears brief discussion. No doubt the popularity of this choice reflects the enormous reliance which American education, at all levels, places on advanced degrees as evidence of preparation for teaching. This evaluation is reflected most clearly in the tangible rewards a Master's degree brings to the elementary or secondary school teacher. Typically, this involves a salary increase of $1,000 or more per year; also, promotion to more important or better paying positions frequently hinges upon whether the applicant has acquired an advanced degree. Little wonder, then, that the prospect of acquiring an M.A. was an important factor for many fellows in their decision to apply for the ExTFP.

Table 4-3. Factors Reported as Important in Fellows' Application to ExTFP

Reason	% 1st Choice	% 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice
Chance to get M.A. degree	28.2	33.6	61.8
Learn about subject matter	26.0	36.2	62.2
Learn effective teaching techniques	23.6	35.4	59.0
Increased professional mobility	7.9	32.2	40.1
Explore higher education for possibility of completing Ph.D. degree	4.6	16.9	21.5
Size of stipend	3.4	21.6	25.0
Increased professional status	3.4	19.4	22.8
Other	2.6	2.2	4.8
No Response	.2	2.5	2.7

It is especially informative to examine the reasons fellows gave for applying to the ExTFP in the light of their first choices for long-range careers, for the factors motivating fellows to apply to the ExTFP varied with their aspirations. Those who expected to remain in elementary or secondary school teaching mentioned with disproportionate frequency the opportunity to receive the M.A. degree and the chance to learn more about their subject matter, but were relatively unlikely to mention the effects their training might have upon their professional mobility. Fellows with an orientation toward college teaching reported that they were particularly motivated toward the M.A. degree and the opportunity to try out graduate school, but were relatively unmotivated by the opportunity to learn about new teaching techniques. Fellows with a desire to become educational specialists were considerably less concerned than the other groups with receiving the M.A. degree or learning about a particular subject, but were very much motivated toward learning new professional techniques and toward professional mobility. Finally, compared to the other groups, fellows who hoped to enter administrative positions showed a particular interest in professional mobility but were relatively uninterested in learning about a particular subject matter.

C. Beliefs Concerning the Proper Functions of Teachers

All respondents were presented with a list of seven functions that have been suggested as those an elementary or secondary school teacher ought to perform, and were asked to order the three which they felt were most important. Following this, fellows were asked to order the three which they believed most of the faculty in their program had chosen, while faculty members and directors were asked to order the three they thought the fellows had chosen.

A comparison of the personal choices made by the three groups of respondents demonstrates a rather marked similarity in the rankings attributed to the different functions. Among all groups, the function most often chosen first was "stimulating a questioning attitude in students," which was followed in all groups by "encouraging the creative abilities of students." Among all groups, also, few respondents placed much emphasis upon "promoting habits of neatness, orderliness, and good behavior" or upon helping students "discover the pleasures and satisfaction of intellectual activity for its own sake." As to the other functions, fellows were more prone than faculty members and directors to rate highly the application of knowledge to practical problems, and fellows were somewhat less likely than faculty members and directors to rank the communication of subject matter high among the seven functions. But it must be emphasized that differences in the popularity of these seven functions from group to group were relatively minor; the differences between fellows' choices and those of the faculty or the directors were not much larger than the average differences between the faculty and the directors.

Table 4-4. Respondents' Own Choices of Most Important Functions of Teachers

Function	Fellows		Faculty		Directors	
	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice
Stimulate students to adopt questioning attitudes toward their studies and the world.	30.1	64.2	38.0	67.0	31.7	61.9
Encourage students to develop and express their own creative abilities as fully as they can.	20.4	66.0	17.4	63.8	25.4	68.3
Help produce individuals who will be able to apply their knowledge to the practical problems of mankind.	17.7	59.1	8.9	47.7	12.7	47.6
Communicate the subject matter so that students are able to acquire the maximum in knowledge and understanding.	10.3	33.0	15.6	45.5	17.5	50.8
Help students develop into mature, well adjusted citizens.	14.6	40.8	10.3	29.5	3.2	28.5
Help students discover the pleasures and satisfaction of intellectual activity for its own sake.	5.5	29.2	6.7	34.8	4.8	27.0
Promote among students general habits of neatness, orderliness, and good behavior.	.4	3.3	0.0	.9	0.0	1.6
No Response	.9	4.1	3.1	10.7	4.8	14.4

Table 4-5. Respondents' Predictions of Others' Choices of Functions of Teachers

Function	Fellows Predicting Staff		Faculty Predicting Fellows		Directors Predicting Fellows	
	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice
Stimulate students to adopt questioning attitudes toward their studies and the world.	16.9	46.8	18.3	43.7	14.3	42.8
Encourage students to develop and express their own creative abilities as fully as they can.	11.1	44.1	15.2	49.1	20.6	58.7
Help produce individuals who will be able to apply their knowledge to the practical problems of mankind.	10.4	46.3	9.8	48.6	14.3	57.1
Communicate the subject matter so that students are able to acquire the maximum in knowledge and understanding.	36.5	61.9	30.4	60.8	30.2	58.8
Help students develop into mature, well adjusted citizens.	10.3	37.2	14.7	43.3	12.7	44.7
Help students discover the pleasures and satisfaction of intellectual activity for its own sake.	6.7	36.3	1.3	16.9	1.6	14.2
Promote among students general habits of neatness, orderliness, and good behavior.	5.1	14.4	0.0	5.4	0.0	4.8
No Response	3.0	12.9	10.3	32.2	6.3	18.9

It is interesting to note that the fellows did not recognize the extent of their agreement with the staff members, nor did the faculty and directors perceive how similar fellows' responses were to their own. In particular, members of each group over-estimated by a substantial margin the commitment of individuals in the other group to the communication of subject matter. Conversely, members of all three groups under-estimated the value that those in the other group placed upon stimulating a questioning attitude in their students and, to a lesser extent, upon encouraging their students to develop their own creative abilities. It appears, in other words, that fellows thought of the staff, and the staff of fellows, as being more committed to an academic traditionalism than was actually the case.

A number of plausible explanations may be advanced for this misperception. It may be, for example, that the similarity of fellows' beliefs to those of the faculty was a recent phenomenon, that it resulted from their contacts and discussions with staff members throughout the year. This explanation could account for the misperception of student beliefs by faculty and directors, whose predictions might accurately have represented fellows' beliefs earlier in the year; however, the same explanation would not account for the fellows' misperception of the beliefs of staff members. Alternatively, it can be argued that a concern for creativity and a questioning attitude are contemporary values in education, in contrast to the traditional preoccupation with the communication of subject matter, and that the present results simply reflect a propensity for members in each group to espouse the modern view and to believe that most of the rest of the world, including members of the other groups, remains traditional and conservative. The relative merits of these and other interpretations, of course, cannot be determined without further investigation.

D. Evaluation of the Goals of the ExTFP

Fellows, faculty, and directors were also asked to pick from a set of eight different possible goals of the ExTFP the three which they felt were most important, to pick the three they thought the other group would choose as most important, and to pick the three they felt were most successfully accomplished.

Again, the three groups showed a remarkable degree of agreement in the ratings they gave these goals. Fellows, faculty, and directors gave about equally high ratings to achieving better understanding of students' behavior and the process of learning and to gaining greater knowledge of the subject matter, with about one fourth of each group choosing each alternative first. In none of the groups was gaining skill at research or gaining a sense of professional identity rated with any frequency among the three most important goals of the ExTFP.

Table 4-6. Respondents' Own Choices of Most Important Goals of ExTFP

	Fellows		Faculty		Directors	
Goal	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice
Develop skills and techniques for teaching special groups; e.g., the gifted, the slow learner.	16.0	38.6	8.0	29.0	9.5	19.0
Foster better understanding of students' behavior and the process of learning.	25.7	52.4	25.4	49.5	27.0	49.2
Gain greater knowledge of the subject matter.	24.9	52.1	27.2	52.6	31.7	60.3
Develop a better understanding of what is most important to teach.	11.5	42.5	17.4	49.5	11.1	38.6
Become more skilled at doing research.	1.5	8.2	0.0	9.8	0.0	12.6
Gain a broader knowledge in the use of new materials and media.	5.8	39.5	6.7	35.2	4.8	38.1
Learn new teaching methods and techniques.	11.5	50.5	10.3	40.3	11.1	52.3
Gain a sense of professional identity.	2.6	13.2	2.7	15.3	3.2	22.2
No Response	.4	1.9	2.2	10.7	1.6	6.4

Table 4-7. Respondents' Predictions of Others' Choices of Most Important Goals of ExTFP

Goal	Fellows Predicting Staff		Faculty Predicting Fellows		Directors Predicting Fellows	
	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice
Develop skills and techniques for teaching special groups; e.g., the gifted, the slow learner.	11.8	25.9	9.8	26.3	12.7	27.0
Foster better understanding of students' behavior and the process of learning.	18.4	43.0	14.7	37.5	15.9	33.3
Gain greater knowledge of the subject matter.	31.3	54.7	29.5	54.9	34.9	54.0
Develop a better understanding of what is most important to teach.	9.7	39.5	10.3	38.0	6.3	41.2
Become more skilled at doing research.	7.1	27.7	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.8
Gain a broader knowledge in the use of new materials and media.	5.9	35.3	7.1	45.5	7.9	49.1
Learn new teaching methods and techniques.	10.2	43.3	17.9	55.9	17.5	51.9
Gain a sense of professional identity.	4.2	21.8	6.7	23.2	3.2	23.8
No Response	1.4	8.9	4.0	14.7	1.6	4.8

As was true with respect to the functions of teachers, each group perceived the other as favoring subject matter over understanding students by a ratio of about two to one. It is interesting to examine the kinds of misperceptions that occurred among respondents in the three groups. Fellows overestimated the evaluation their faculty members gave to becoming skilled at research and--for faculty members but not directors--to learning the subject matter; fellows underestimated staff members' evaluation of understanding students' behavior and the process of learning, and--for the faculty but not for directors--their evaluation of helping fellows learn what is important to teach. On the other side, the judgments by faculty members and directors overestimated fellows' ratings of learning the subject matter and learning new methods and techniques; staff members underestimated fellows' ratings of understanding students' behavior, learning how to teach special groups, and learning what is important to teach. Put somewhat differently, the fellows perceived the faculty as more concerned than was actually the case with the central core of traditional graduate training, skill at research and the transmission of knowledge, and less concerned than was correct with the more classroom-oriented goals of understanding student behavior and helping fellows learn what is important to teach. Faculty members and directors, on the other hand, perceived fellows as more concerned than was the case with self-oriented goals such as acquiring knowledge and learning teaching techniques, and less concerned than was actually true with developing student-oriented skills and understanding, i.e., understanding student behavior, learning how to teach special groups, and learning what is important to teach.

Perhaps the respondents' perceptions of the values of other groups reflected their judgments of the goals that were accomplished by the ExTFP, for in all three groups the most commonly mentioned accomplishment was the acquisition of subject matter. Just over a third of the respondents in each group said this was the goal that was best achieved. About 20% of the fellows and faculty, and 13% of the directors, reported that the goal which was best accomplished was fostering understanding of students' behavior and the process of learning. No other goal was judged best accomplished by as many as one eighth of the respondents in any group.

It is interesting, again, to compare respondents' judgments of the goals that were accomplished in their programs to their evaluations of the most important objectives for the ExTFP to pursue. Many more fellows reported that the acquisition of knowledge was best accomplished than reported it was the most important goal, though this difference diminishes when one examines the fellows' first three ratings instead of only their highest rating. Similarly, many more fellows reported that one of the three goals best accomplished was the development of research skills than rated this as one of the three most important goals. Conversely, more fellows believed that developing skills for teaching special groups should be a goal of the ExTFP than reported that this goal was among those best accomplished.

Table 4-8. Respondents' Judgments of the Goals That Were Best Accomplished

Goal	Fellows Judgments		Faculty Judgments		Directors Judgments	
	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice	% 1st Choice	% 1st + % 2nd + % 3rd Choice
Develop skills and techniques for teaching special groups; e.g., the gifted, the slow learner.	8.2	22.9	5.8	21.4	9.5	15.8
Foster better understanding of students' behavior and the process of learning.	21.0	43.1	19.2	37.1	12.7	34.9
Gain greater knowledge of the subject matter.	36.5	60.9	34.4	55.4	36.5	60.3
Develop a better understanding of what is most important to teach.	9.0	40.1	9.4	38.0	9.5	34.9
Become more skilled at doing research.	4.6	23.7	.9	11.2	0.0	12.6
Gain a broader knowledge in the use of new materials and media.	8.3	40.1	10.7	41.9	11.1	42.8
Learn new teaching methods and techniques.	7.5	39.3	8.0	47.3	11.1	52.4
Gain a sense of professional identity.	4.2	20.3	7.1	29.8	6.3	36.4
No Response	.8	9.0	4.5	17.9	3.2	9.6

Among faculty members, also, more reported that the acquisition of knowledge was best accomplished than reported it was the most important goal; again, the difference diminishes when the first three ratings are examined instead of only the goal best accomplished. In distinction from fellows' judgments, more faculty members said a sense of professional identity was among the goals best achieved by the ExTFP than said it should be among the most important objectives. At the other extreme, there were two goals which were less often rated by the faculty as achieved than as important: promoting the understanding of students' behavior and helping fellows understand what is most important to teach.

The difference between the values placed on these goals and the ratings of goal accomplishment was smaller for the judgments by the directors than for those by the other two groups. Only with respect to promoting the understanding of students' behavior and the achievement of a sense of identity were there substantial differences between directors' ratings of importance and their ratings of accomplishment. In the first instance (understanding student behavior), more directors said the goal was important than said it was accomplished, in the second (achievement of a sense of professional identity) fewer said it was important than said it was achieved.

To sum up, faculty and fellows held similar goals for the ExTFP but each believed that the other held different goals. The possible explanations of the misperceptions parallel those given on page 30 for another, similar pattern of misperceptions. Which explanation is best is not certain at this time, though we prefer the notion that each group assumes it is in the advance guard and the other in the rear guard. One potential byproduct of this misperception is interesting: Both groups agree as to what they want to achieve, both agree that the outcome was different from what they wanted, and each group assumes the other desired the outcome that was achieved. Each, then, is disappointed but can blame their disappointment on the other group.

E. Summary

That the fellows were an ambitious group was revealed by their aspirations for the future. Their most common long-range aspiration was teaching in a junior college or a four-year college. Only half of the fellows expected to remain in elementary or secondary schools, either as teachers or as educational specialists. Of these, half were being trained as educational specialists, so that only about 25% of the total group expressed a desire to be in elementary and secondary teaching over the long run, and only about 10% reported that they hoped to be classroom teachers in their present schools five to ten years hence. The extent of these aspirations was not recognized by the faculty and staff of the ExTFP, 80% to 90% of whom predicted that most fellows would continue to be employed in elementary or secondary schools during the next five to ten years, either as teachers or as educational specialists. The implications of this outcome are discussed at length in Chapter 10.

The most common reasons fellows gave for applying for their fellowships were the chance to obtain an advanced degree, the opportunity to learn more about the subject matter and about effective teaching techniques, and the possibility of increased professional mobility. As might be expected, respondents' reports of which of the factors influenced their decisions to apply for the fellowship reflected their career aspirations.

To a surprising extent, fellows, faculty members, and directors showed similar patterns in their judgments about the most important functions of teachers. In all three groups, the most commonly-chosen functions were stimulating creativity and a questioning attitude. The communication of subject matter was chosen only third most often by the directors and fourth most often by the faculty and fellows. However, in their estimates of the other group's attitudes, the fellows' predictions of the attitudes of staff members and the faculty's and directors' predictions of fellows' attitudes consistently overestimated the popularity of communicating the subject matter and underestimated the popularity of stimulating the student's creativity and a questioning attitude toward his studies and the world.

Somewhat the same pattern held for respondents' judgments of the proper goals for ExTFP programs to pursue. There was a remarkable similarity in the pattern of personal choices in the three groups. There was a tendency, however, for respondents to expect those in the other group to be more concerned than was true with gaining knowledge, and less concerned than was the case with understanding student behavior or with helping fellows learn what is most important to teach. In all groups, the goal most often considered to be best attained was gaining greater knowledge of subject matter.

III. Perceptions and Evaluations of How the Program Operated

Having discussed at some length the characteristics of the fellows and faculty who took part in the ExTFP, we turn now to judgments by these participants of the effectiveness of their programs and of other aspects of their educational experiences. It will be convenient to present these results under five general headings.

The first set of results, to be presented in Chapter 5, deals with judgments of effectiveness and morale. In Chapter 6, we will turn to perceptions of the coordination of components within the program, including judgments as to whether the program made extensive use of the fellows' background, reports of the extent of interdepartmental cooperation, and estimates of the relative emphasis upon subject matter and methods of instruction. Following this, Chapter 7 will discuss the specific evaluations by fellows and faculty of the extent of problems encountered in the program's operation, the relation between fellows and faculty, and the courses that were offered. In Chapter 8, examination will be undertaken of the operating strategies of the programs, including the extent of innovativeness, the amount of competition among fellows, the work load, and whether fellows could earn an advanced degree. Finally, Chapter 9 will present a set of comparisons of programs which were housed in Departments of Education with those officially housed elsewhere.

A common pattern of organization will be followed in these chapters. First, for each item concerned, the proportion of respondents whose answers fell in each alternative will be presented. Secondly, the correlations among the items that are included within the chapter will be presented and discussed. Finally, we will discuss the correlations of the items within each chapter to the items of preceding chapters.

Chapter 5

Program Effectiveness and Fellows' Morale

A. Effectiveness

1. Judgments of Effectiveness

However carefully one may distinguish conceptually between judgments about the effectiveness of a program and statments of satisfaction with it, it is difficult to maintain that distinction in practice. In fact, responses to items that are intended to measure one of these variables are almost always highly correlated with responses to items that are intended to measure the other. Such was the case in the present study. Therefore, the two kinds of judgments will be grouped together, and will be considered to reflect participants' evaluation of the success of the programs in which they were involved.

There were five items, identical on the fellows' and faculty questionnaires, which may reasonably be considered to fall within this category. The first of these asked whether the fellows seemed genuinely interested in the subject matter of their program. It was asked in the 1966-67 study as well. Respondents in all roles and in both years answered predominantly in the affirmative. A smaller proportion of fellows in 1967-68 than in 1966-67 reported that their associates definitely showed interest in the subject matter; nevertheless, in both years 95% of the fellows said it was either definitely correct or for the most part true that the participants seemed genuinely interested in the subject matter of the program. Faculty members and directors were even more favorable than were the fellows, with the directors' responses in 1967-68 being somewhat more enthusiastic than those by their counterparts in 1966-67.

Table 5-1. Judgments of Fellows' Interest in the Subject

Did the participants seem genuinely interested in the subject matter of the Program?	1966-67 Fellows	1967-68 Fellows	1966-67 Faculty	1967-68 Faculty	1966-67 Directors	1967-68 Directors
Definitely yes	48.0	33.8	53.5	56.7	60.0	65.1
For the most part, yes	46.8	60.8	42.2	40.6	40.0	34.9
For the most part, no	4.8	5.0	1.1	1.8	0.0	0.0
Almost completely not	0.0	.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No Response	.3	.2	3.2	.9	0.0	0.0

Fellows were asked how stimulating and interesting they had found the ExTFP; faculty members and directors were asked how the fellows seemed to have reacted to the ExTFP, with the identical alternatives offered as responses. As may be seen, three fourths or more of each group said that the program was either usually stimulating and interesting or stimulating and interesting throughout. It is evident, again, that the fellows in 1966-67 were somewhat more favorable in their evaluations than those in 1967-68, and that faculty members and directors gave more favorable responses than did fellows.

Table 5-2. Judgments of Fellows' Reaction to the ExTFP

Fellows' reaction to the ExTFP	Fellows 1966-67	Fellows 1967-68	Faculty 1967-68	Directors 1967-68
Stimulating and interesting throughout	32.0	26.5	28.6	23.8
Usually stimulating and interesting	50.4	51.1	66.5	74.6
Only occasionally stimulating and interesting	16.4	20.4	4.0	1.6
Seldom or never stimulating and interesting	1.2	1.6	0.0	0.0
No Response	0.0	0.4	0.9	0.0

If the preceding questions appear to reflect respondents' satisfaction with the program more than their judgments of its effectiveness, more direct judgments of effectiveness were given in three additional items. In one of these, respondents were asked how useful the program had been in helping fellows handle their own teaching situations and their own students. Again, 80% or more of every group said that the program was at least moderately useful in this respect. Again, 1967-68 fellows were slightly less favorable in their judgments than either the faculty and directors or the fellows from the preceding year.

Table 5-3. Ratings of the Program's Usefulness for Fellows' Own Teaching

How useful was the program in preparing fellows to handle their own teaching situations and their own students?	Fellows 1966-67	Fellows 1967-68	Faculty 1967-68	Directors 1967-68
Extremely useful	41.7	35.8	42.0	57.1
Moderately useful	37.1	43.4	47.8	39.7
Somewhat useful	17.9	18.2	7.1	1.6
Not useful at all	2.7	2.6	0.0	0.0
No Response	0.6	0.1	3.1	1.6

In a similar question, respondents were asked how realistic and useful the objectives of their program had been in terms of the fellows' own interests, experiences, and job responsibilities. For all groups, the most typical responses were either very realistic or fairly realistic, with a few saying that the objectives were exceptionally realistic and a few others saying that they were not too realistic. For this question, responses of fellows in the two years did not differ appreciably. Again, however, responses of faculty members and directors were more extreme than those of fellows.

Table 5-4. Evaluation of Program Objectives

How realistic and useful were the objectives of your program?	Fellows 1966-67	Fellows 1967-68	Faculty 1967-68	Directors 1967-68
Exceptionally realistic	11.7	12.3	9.4	17.5
Very realistic	38.1	38.1	56.2	58.7
Fairly realistic	36.3	37.7	29.5	22.2
Not too realistic	12.4	9.9	3.1	1.6
Not at all realistic	1.5	1.8	0.9	0.0
No Response	0.0	0.2	0.9	0.0

As a final measure of program success, respondents were asked to describe fellows' reactions to the ExTFP as a learning experience. Two thirds or more of each group reported they felt fellows learned a great deal, and more than 95% of each group said they learned at least a moderate amount. Once again, the judgments by faculty members were more favorable than those by fellows, and judgments by directors were the most favorable of all.

Table 5-5. Judgments of How Much the Fellows Learned

Which of the following best describes your judgment of the ExTFP as a learning experience for the fellows?	Fellows 1967-68	Faculty 1967-68	Directors 1967-68
They learned a great deal	66.7	72.8	87.3
They learned a moderate amount	28.7	25.9	12.7
They really didn't learn very much	4.2	0.9	0.0
They learned virtually nothing at all	0.0	0.0	0.0
No Response	0.3	0.4	0.0

2. Correlations among Judgments of Effectiveness

On each of these items, there was considerable variation from one program to another in the average ratings that were given by fellows and by faculty members. That is, some programs were uniformly judged to be very effective while others were judged to be less effective. It was important to determine whether these ratings varied with one another, whether programs which received high ratings on one judgment of effectiveness were rated highly on other dimensions, as well. To examine this relationship, the averages of the ratings by faculty and fellows, on all of the relevant items, were obtained for each institution. This permitted the institutions to be arrayed on each dimension according to the evaluations they received from the two sets of participants. Correlation coefficients were then computed among these pairs of judgments.

Such correlations were not computed between the judgments by fellows and faculty members, on the one hand, and those by program directors, on the other. Directors' ratings were excluded from the correlations because their judgments were so overwhelmingly favorable, being concentrated at the most favorable possible alternatives. Such a pattern of response is not amenable to a correlational analysis because two sets of judgments cannot be correlated unless, within each set, there is some variation in the responses from one institution to another. Thus, if all of the responses to one item fall at the identical point, as was substantially true for many of the directors' judgments, then those responses cannot possibly co-vary with responses to some other item. Therefore, the tables of correlation will be based upon responses by fellows and faculty members only.

As will be seen in the accompanying table, the average responses of fellows on the five measures of program success were highly inter-correlated. Ratings by fellows of their interest in the program showed only moderate correlations with their ratings on some of the

Table 5-6. Correlations among Judgments of Effectiveness[1]

		Fellows' Judgments					Faculty Judgements				
	Item	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Fellows' Judgments	1. Fellows' interest	---	.61	.32	.27	.51	$\boxed{.38}$		.39		
	2. How stimulating?		---	.75	.77	.86	.33	$\boxed{.38}$	.24		.25
	3. Usefulness to job			---	.89	.68	.31	.32	$\boxed{.46}$	.27	
	4. Realism of objectives				---	.74		.24	.37	$\boxed{.28}$	
	5. Learning experience					---		.32			$\boxed{.30}$
Faculty Judgments	1. Fellows' interest						---	.45	.42	.32	.36
	2. How stimulating							---	.37	.36	.42
	3. Usefulness to job								---	.47	.33
	4. Realism of objectives									---	.48
	5. Learning experience										---

[1] In this and subsequent correlation tables, correlation coefficients will be entered only when a correlation of the same or greater size would be expected by chance alone less often than five percent of the time; when the correlation between two measures does not meet this criterion, the corresponding cell in the table will be left blank.

other variables; for the other four variables, however, the intercorrelations among fellows' judgments were very high. Intercorrelations of measures of program success as judged by faculty members were also consistently positive, though not as high as the correlations among fellows' judgments. As to agreement between fellows' and faculty judgments, 15 of the 25 correlations were significantly greater than zero. It should be noted that the correlations between faculty and fellows' judgments on the same items (enclosed in the correlation matrix with small squares) were all significantly different from zero.

This pattern of correlations suggests three conclusions. First, the judgments on these five items by fellows and by faculty members tend to hang together. Institutions which receive high ratings from their participants on one measure tend to receive correspondingly high ratings on another. Second, this pattern was stronger for fellows' judgments than for faculty judgments, perhaps because the average of the faculty judgments in every institution was so extremely favorable that the possibility of co-variation on two measures was greatly diminished. Third, there was an encouraging pattern of correlations between the fellows' ratings and ratings by faculty members at the same institutions, especially on responses to the same items, indicating that the rankings of institutions according to the average judgments by fellows and by faculty members were generally congruent.

B. Fellows' Solidarity and Morale

1. Reports of Morale and Solidarity

In the guidelines for ExTFP proposals, the Office of Education specifically required that programs be devised in which the experienced teachers would take a substantial block of their courses in common. The intent of this requirement was not only to assure that the academic experience would be directly relevant to the needs of the experienced teacher, but also to foster among the fellows a feeling of mutual support and common purpose. In the questionnaires, three questions were asked of both fellows and staff members to obtain their judgments of the extent to which the en bloc approach had eventuated in high morale and group involvement. In addition, each fellow was asked to describe his own morale, and staff members were asked for a specific judgment about the effects of the en bloc approach upon the success of the program.

The first of these questions asked how the ExTFP fellows typically interacted with each other. Responses generally revealed considerable group cooperation. Three fourths or more of the fellows, the faculty, and the directors said there was either moderate or much group involvement, and only a tiny proportion reported rivalry and competition in their group. Once again, faculty members reported greater group involvement than did the fellows and the directors reported greater involvement than did faculty members.

Table 5-7. Reports of Amount of Group Involvement and Cooperation

Describe how the ExTFP fellows typically interacted with one another.	Fellows 1967-68	Faculty 1967-68	Directors 1967-68
Much group involvement	18.8	34.8	39.7
Moderate group cooperation	56.0	53.6	49.2
Some incompatibility	11.4	6.2	9.5
Relatively little cooperation	13.4	2.7	0.0
Rivalry and competition	.4	.4	1.6
No Response	0.0	2.2	0.0

Ratings of group spirit and identity and of overall morale among participants were made in both 1966-67 and 1967-68 by fellows, faculty members and directors. Examination of Tables 5-8 and 5-9 shows, first, that 80% or more of the respondents in every role in both years said that there was either strong or moderate group spirit in their program. While the differences in ratings on this item between the 1966-67 participants and those in 1967-68 are not large, they show an interesting pattern: fellows gave somewhat less favorable judgments of group spirit the second year than the first, while faculty members and directors gave somewhat more favorable ratings in the second year.

Table 5-8. Judgments of Group Spirit and Identity

Was there a feeling of group spirit and identity among the fellows in the program?	Fellows		Faculty		Directors	
	1966-67	1967-68	1966-67	1967-68	1966-67	1967-68
Strong group spirit	46.3	43.9	52.9	68.3	66.7	74.6
Moderate group spirit	37.8	35.1	38.0	26.3	26.7	19.0
Not too much group spirit	14.4	17.4	4.8	3.1	6.7	6.3
No appreciable group spirit	1.2	3.5	.5	.4	0.0	0.0
No Response	.3	.1	3.7	1.8	0.0	0.0

A similar pattern occurred in respondents' estimates of the overall morale of the fellows. More than half of the respondents in each role reported that morale was either pretty high or very high, and less than 15% in any role said morale was either pretty low or very low. In both years, faculty members perceived fellows' morale to be higher than did the fellows themselves, and directors made the most favorable judgments of all. Once again, fewer fellows in 1967-68 than in 1966-67 rated participants' morale as very high or pretty high (52% as against 60%). By contrast, more faculty members in 1967-68 than in the preceding year rated participants' morale as very high or pretty high (83% as compared to 79%), and this difference was even greater for ratings by directors in the two years (94% as against 80%).

Table 5-9. Judgments of Overall Morale

How would you rate the overall morale of the participants?	Fellows		Faculty		Directors	
	1966-67	1967-68	1966-67	1967-68	1966-67	1967-68
Very high	22.0	13.4	27.8	35.7	37.8	76.2
Pretty high	38.5	38.7	50.8	46.9	42.2	17.5
About average	26.8	33.9	13.9	13.0	17.8	6.3
Pretty low	10.3	11.6	2.7	2.2	2.2	0.0
Very low	1.3	2.0	.5	.9	0.0	0.0
No Response	1.1	.3	4.3	1.3	0.0	0.0

In addition to these three questions, fellows were asked to rate their own individual morale. In both years, over 60% of the fellows reported their morale to be either very high or pretty high, while fewer than one fellow in eight reported that his morale was either very low or pretty low. Ratings of morale were slightly lower in 1967-68 than in the preceding year.

Table 5-10. Fellows' Reports of Their Own Morale

How would you rate your own morale?	Fellows 1966-67	Fellows 1967-68
Very high	30.2	24.8
Pretty high	36.0	36.6
About average	23.9	26.3
Pretty low	7.4	9.6
Very low	1.6	2.5
No Response	.9	.2

The final question to be discussed in this section involved judgments by faculty members and directors concerning the effects upon learning of the fact that fellows studied and worked as a group. The most common response of both groups was that the en bloc approach greatly enhanced learning; about 90% of the respondents in each group reported at least a noticeable group effect upon the amount that fellows learned.

Table 5-11. Faculty Evaluation of En-Bloc Approach

Has the fact that ExTFP fellows studied and worked as a group resulted in more satisfactory learning?	Faculty 1967-68	Directors 1967-68
Greatly enhanced their learning	54.9	76.2
There was a noticeable group effect	34.4	17.5
I am doubtful of the group effect	5.4	6.3
The group effect didn't enhance learning	1.3	0.0
The group effect interfered with learning	1.3	0.0
No Response	2.7	0.0

Thus, by all accounts there was a substantial degree of group involvement in the ExTFP, there was considerable group spirit, morale was quite high, and the en bloc approach contributed to the effectiveness of the program. As was true in judgments of program success, faculty members' estimates of group morale and solidarity were higher than those by fellows, and estimates by directors were the highest of all.

2. Correlations among Measures of Morale and Solidarity

As may be seen in Table 5-12, there was a very strong relationship among the four evaluations that fellows made of the level of morale, group involvement, and group

Table 5-12. Correlations among Measures of Morale and Solidarity

		Fellows' Judgments				Faculty Judgments			
	Item	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	5
Fellows' Judgments	1. Group involvement	---	.85	.77	.61	.44	.32	.37	.33
	2. Spirit and identity		---	.64	.44	.47	.40	.37	.40
	3. Overall morale			---	.91	.25	.38	.53	.37
	4. R's own morale				---		.28	.44	.26
Faculty Judgments	1. Group involvement					---	.54	.39	.46
	2. Spirit and identity						---	.57	.50
	3. Overall morale							---	.60
	5. Value of *en bloc* approach								---

identity. Programs which received high ratings on one question tended to be given high ratings on the other three questions, as well. Faculty ratings on the four measures of program morale also showed a pattern of positive intercorrelations; these correlations were somewhat higher, on the average, than those among faculty ratings of program success. Finally, all but one of fellows' judgments of morale and group involvement correlated significantly with the corresponding faculty judgments. In particular, the responses by fellows and faculty members to the same items (enclosed by squares in the table of correlations) were consistently and strongly correlated. It appears, then, that there were consistent differences among the 68 programs in the level of morale and group solidarity among the fellows, that the different measures of group spirit and cohesiveness produced similar orderings of the programs, and that fellows and faculty members were in substantial agreement as to the relative standing of their own program on these variables.

3. Correlation of Judgments of Morale and Solidarity with Measures of Program Effectiveness

In the 1966-67 study there was a strong positive relationship between respondents' judgments of fellows' morale and solidarity and their judgments of program effectiveness, although the correlation of measures from different sources (i.e. the correlation of fellows' judgments of morale with faculty judgments of effectiveness, or faculty judgments of morale with fellows' judgments of effectiveness) were considerably weaker than the correlations between the two sets of measures from the same source. The same pattern held in the present results. In the judgments made by fellows, 19 of the 20 correlations between measures of morale and measure of success were significantly greater than zero, and 11 of these correlations were greater than .50. Similarly, 15 of the 20 correlations among the two sets of ratings from faculty members were significantly greater than zero. On the

Table 5-13. Correlations of Morale and Solidarity with Effectiveness

		Judgments of Effectivness									
		By Fellows					By Faculty				
	Ratings of Morale and Solidarity	Fellows' interest	How stimulating?	Usefulness to job	Realism of objectives	Learning experience	Fellows' interest	How stimulating?	Usefulness to job	Realism of objectives	Learning experience
Fellows' Judgments	1. Group involvement	.53	.46	.47	.42	.36					
	2. Spirit and identity	.57	.34	.32	.27		.26				
	3. Overall morale	.60	.66	.63	.63	.57	.31	.33			.28
	4. R's own morale	.49	.76	.67	.73	.65	.25	.36			.24
Faculty Judgments	1. Group involvement						.52				
	2. Spirit and identity	.31					.38	.32	.31		.37
	3. Overall morale	.31	.24	.31	.31		.50	.45	.40	.35	.46
	4. *En bloc* approach	.33		.29			.62	.42	.34	.32	.41

other hand, with respect to ratings made by different sources, only fellows' judgments of overall morale and of their own morale correlated consistently with faculty ratings of success. In the same way, only faculty ratings of overall morale correlated consistently with fellows' ratings of program success.

Some comments are in order concerning the interpretation of these correlations. When two variables show a sizeable correlation, it is often tempting and sometimes reasonable to conclude that they are somehow causally related. This temptation should only be indulged with caution, for causal relationships cannot be established by correlational techniques. Thus, the high positive correlations between fellows' morale and their judgments of effectiveness does not mean that high morale produces an effective program. It is equally likely that the causal chain goes in the other direction, that morale goes down when a program becomes ineffective or up as effectiveness increases. It is also plausible that the two variables interact, so that some degree of ineffectiveness depresses morale which, unless some action is taken, further lowers the level of effectiveness, thereby decreasing morale even further. The point is, that one should be cautious in interpreting correlations. The results in this and other chapters of this report will often seem to point toward ways by which programs can be improved. We believe, in fact, that the results offer suggestions for improvement. But these suggestions must be examined intelligently, not accepted uncritically as a consequence of impressively large correlation coefficients.

With these reservations in mind, the results of the correlation matrix presented in Table 5-13 may be summarized by two generalization. First, correlations between ratings of effectiveness and judgments of group solidarity and morale were consistently positive. This outcome supports the common observation, which was confirmed again in the intensive study of three programs in the 1967-68 academic year, that people who are profiting from an educational program will experience high morale, and that morale plummets as a program becomes ineffective. Second, judgments of morale were more highly correlated with program success than were judgments of group involvement and group spirit. It seems that some relatively unsuccessful programs had a cohesive and a solidary group of students, united in opposition to their program, whose overall morale was relatively low, thus, the correlation between group spirit and effectiveness was diminished, while that between morale and effectiveness remained high.

C. Summary

As was true in the 1966-67 study, respondents made remarkably favorable judgments of the effectiveness of the program. Fellows' judgments of effectiveness were slightly less positive in the 1967-68 study than had been those by fellows of the preceding year. On the other hand, judgments of effectiveness by faculty members and directors were somewhat higher in 1967-68 than in the preceding study. Despite the rather small differences in the pattern of responses for the two years, in both studies the ExTFP was judged to have been extremely effective by the great majority of respondents. In the present study, as in that of the preceding year, correlations among items of effectiveness were very large, indicating that the judgments on these disparate items corresponded to qualities of the program which varied together.

Respondents also judged fellows' morale to have been very high. Again, morale was rated as slightly less high by fellows in the 1967-68 study than by their counterparts in the 1966-67 study, but it was rated as slightly higher by faculty members and directors in the present study than by those in the preceding year. As was true in the earlier study, the four judgments of morale and group solidarity were highly correlated with one another. Though both morale and solidarity correlated with measures of program effectiveness, the correlations of morale with effectiveness were consistently higher than those between group spirit and effectiveness.

Chapter 6

Coordination among Components of the Program

The Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program was established in the conviction that experienced teachers required a different type of academic program from that of the typical undergraduate or graduate student. For one thing, to qualify for the program, fellows had to have considerable experience in teaching. Consequently, it was required by the Office of Education that the participating institutions build into their proposals some mechanism for putting to use the considerable knowledge the fellows' would have gained from their extensive experience. In addition, it seemed clear to the designers of the ExTFP that the experienced teacher would profit most from a program in which there was a healthy blend of exposure to a subject matter with involvement in new and imaginative methods of instruction. As an indication of the institution's intention to combine the two kinds of activities, all proposals for ExTFP support had to bear the signature of two institutional officials: that person responsible for instruction in the subject matter of the program and the person responsible for teacher training. Furthermore, the institution was required to make explicit the kind of interdepartmental cooperation that would be established and to show how it proposed to accomplish a satisfactory mixture of instruction in subject matter and in pedagogy.

Items were included in the questionnaires pertaining to each of these requirements: the use of fellows' backgrounds, the coordination among departments, and the balance in emphasis between subject matter and methods of instruction. In this chapter, we shall discuss each of these topics in turn, then examine the correlation of responses to the three topics, and finally discuss the relationship of measures of coordination among program components to judgments of effectiveness and morale.

A. The Extent of Program Coordination

1. Use of Fellows' Background

In both the 1966-67 and 1967-68 questionnaires, fellows were asked whether their program built on their own background or seemed to give no consideration to their backgrounds. A similar question, with identical alternatives, was asked of the faculty and directors in the 1967-68 programs. There was a marked disparity between fellows and staff members in their responses to the item. In the 1967-68 group, just over 55% of the fellows reported that their program usually or consistently made use of their backgrounds, while almost 45% reported that their background was rarely or never of use. Responses of fellows in the 1966-67 survey were somewhat more favorable to the program, the comparable percentages being 63% and 36%. By contrast, nearly three fourths of the faculty in the 1967-68 program, and over 95% of the directors reported that their program usually or consistently built upon the fellows' backgrounds.

Table 6-1. Judgments of the Use of Fellows' Backgrounds

Did the Program build on participants' backgrounds?	Fellows 1966-67	Fellows 1967-68	Faculty 1967-68	Directors 1967-68
Consistently built on backgrounds	15.5	12.5	25.0	38.1
Usually built on backgrounds	47.6	43.7	58.9	58.7
Only rarely built on backgrounds	23.8	25.6	8.9	1.6
Seemed unconcerned for backgrounds	12.5	17.7	4.5	1.6
No Response	0.6	0.4	2.7	0.0

It is important to ask which group of observers--the fellows or the staff members--was more nearly correct in judging how well the programs utilized the extensive backgrounds of their participants. Two lines of reasoning, one subjective and one objective, argue that the more pessimistic judgments of the fellows were also the more accurate. As to the subjective reason, the fellows obviously knew a great deal more than did the faculty about the nature of their own background and experience; for that reason, they ought to be better judges of whether an educational program built upon that background. This inference was confirmed objectively by the results of the 1966-67 study. The teams of evaluators held lengthy interviews with fellows and staff members in 31 ExTFP institutions, and then rated the extent to which those programs made use of the fellows' experience. Their ratings correlated significantly with fellows' judgments on this variable but not with faculty judgments. In sum, therefore, we are more inclined to accept the fellows' reports on this item than faculty reports; by the fellows' testimony, 55% to 60% of the programs did usually or consistently build upon the background and experience of their participants, while 40% to 45% rarely or never did so.

2. Coordination among Activities and Departments

Two questions were asked of respondents concerning coordination of the parts of their program. One question dealt with the coordination of the various courses, the other with interdepartmental cooperation. The differences among respondents from different roles that have characterized the earlier results held true once again. About two thirds of the fellows in the 1967-68 programs, as compared to 62% in 1966-67, reported that the different components of their program--i.e., lecture courses, seminars, instruction in media and methods, laboratories or workshops, and field trips--were either usually coordinated or exceptionally well coordinated and related. The comparable figures for faculty and directors were 75% and 87% respectively.

Table 6-2. Judgments of Coordination of Program's Components

How well were the components of your program coordinated and related to one another?	Fellows 1966-67	Fellows 1967-68	Faculty 1967-68	Directors 1967-68
Exceptionally well coordinated	16.5	21.3	22.8	23.8
Usually coordinated but sometimes not	45.3	44.1	51.8	63.5
Sometimes coordinated, usually not	28.4	24.3	19.2	11.1
Seldom or never coordinated	9.2	9.6	2.2	0.0
No Response	1.0	0.2	4.0	1.6

The same pattern held for coordination of courses from different departments. In the 1966-67 survey, about the same proportion of fellows said such courses did not fit together well as said they did fit well; in 1967-68 somewhat more fellows said such courses fitted together than said they did not. By comparison, nearly 60% of the faculty members and 73% of the directors reported that instruction from different departments was well coordinated. Once more, and on the same grounds as for the previous item, it seems likely that the fellows' judgments were more nearly correct.

Table 6-3. Reports of Interdepartmental Coordination

If your program involved instruction in more than one department, how well was the material in one department coordinated with that in another?	Fellows 1966-67	Fellows 1967-68	Faculty 1967-68	Directors 1967-68
They fitted together very well	7.8	12.3	14.7	20.6
They fitted together quite well	34.5	35.8	43.8	52.4
They didn't fit together too well	27.6	26.7	22.3	20.6
They didn't fit together at all	14.5	13.0	3.6	3.2
Inapplicable to my program	11.8	9.8	(not included)	
No Response	3.7	2.3	15.6	3.2

3. Relative Emphasis on Subject Matter and Methods of Teaching

Judgments, by respondents in the three roles, of the relative emphasis on subject matter and teaching showed an interesting pattern. Half of the fellows, one third of the faculty, and one-fourth of the directors reported that there was more emphasis on subject matter than on teaching methods. On the other hand, the proportion saying that there was more emphasis on teaching methods than on subject matter did not exceed 10% in any group. The replies of the three groups of respondents differed remarkably in the proportion who reported a satisfactory balance between subject matter and teaching methods; 39% of the fellows, 52% of the faculty, and 68% of the directors gave this response. It should be noted that even though the fellows tended to report that subject matter received more emphasis than teaching methods, only 11% said it received too much emphasis.

Table 6-4. Reports of Relative Emphasis upon Subject Matter and Teaching Methods

How about the relative emphasis on subject matter and on methods of teaching?	Fellows 1967-68	Faculty 1967-68	Directors 1967-68
Too much emphasis on subject matter	11.0	9.9	0.0
More emphasis on subject matter than teaching	38.7	23.1	25.4
A satisfactory balance between the two	37.8	51.8	68.3
More emphasis on teaching than subject matter	9.0	7.1	6.3
Too much emphasis on teaching methods	1.8	1.3	0.0
No Response	1.8	6.7	0.0

B. Correlation among Measures of Program Coordination

As is evident in Table 6-5, there was a consistent positive relationship among fellows' responses to these four measures. Programs whose fellows reported that their background had been utilized in their experience were also those in which satisfactory cooperation was reported among departments, along with a satisfactory balance between subject matter and teaching methods. The faculty's reported emphasis on subject matter and teaching methods did not correlate with their judgments of either the use of fellows' background or the coordination among the program's components. Correlations among the other faculty responses were of moderate size. As to correlations between judgments by fellows and those by faculty members, three of the four responses to the same questions (set off by squares in the table) yielded significant correlations. In particular, it should be noted that there was high agreement between fellows and faculty as to whether the program emphasized subject matter or teaching methods. Furthermore, programs whose faculty reported an emphasis on subject matter over teaching methods tended also to be those whose fellows reported that their background was not utilized and that the components of their program were not well coordinated.

Table 6-5. Correlations among Measures of Program Coordination

	Item	Fellows' Judgments 1	2a	2b	3	Faculty Judgments 1	2a	2b	3
Fellows' Judgments	1. Use of background	---	.76	.53	-.63		.26		-.40
	2a. Coordination of courses		---	.56	-.48		.43	.36	-.30
	2b. Interdepartmental coop.			---	-.32			.26	-.28
	3. Emphasis on subject matter				---	-.27	-.26		.63
Faculty Judgments	1. Use of background					---	.35	.30	
	2a. Coordination of courses						---	.42	
	2b. Interdepartmental coop.							---	
	3. Emphasis on subject matter								---

C. Correlation of Program Coordination with Effectiveness and Morale

Because the different measures of effectiveness and of morale within a single group of respondents were so highly intercorrelated, it will not be necessary to present the correlations between the four measures of program coordination and each of the items that dealt with effectiveness and morale. Instead, Table 6-6 presents the average of the correlations between each measure of program coordination and fellows' and faculty judgments of effectiveness and morale.

Table 6-6. Correlations of Program Coordination with Effectiveness and Morale

	Item	Fellows' Report Effectiveness	Fellows' Report Morale	Faculty Report Effectiveness	Faculty Report Morale
Fellows' Judgments	1. Use of background	.66	.57	.32	.25
	2a. Coordination of courses	.63	.50	.35	.23
	2b. Interdepartmental coop.	.42	.38		
	3. Emphasis on subject matter	-.39	-.26	-.32	-.24
Faculty Judgments	1. Use of background				.23
	2a. Coordination of courses			.40	.28
	2b. Interdepartmental coop.				
	3. Emphasis on subject matter	-.31			

For fellows' responses, the magnitude of these correlations is impressive. Programs whose fellows reported that their background was utilized in the conduct of the program and that the courses in their program were well coordinated were also programs whose fellows and faculty members reported a high degree of effectiveness and of morale among the fellows. Fellows' judgments of interdepartmental cooperation also correlated significantly with fellows' reports of effectiveness and morale, but not with such reports by faculty members. Fellows' judgments of the degree of emphasis on subject matter, as compared to methods of instruction, bore a modest inverse relationship with every measure of morale and effectiveness.

This pattern of large correlations did not hold for the judgments of faculty members. Though there was some tendency for such judgments to be correlated with the faculty's own reports on effectiveness and morale, there was only one instance in which faculty judgments on these topics yielded a significant average correlation with fellows' reports of morale and effectiveness: faculty estimates of the extent of emphasis on subject matter was inversely related to fellows' judgments of program effectiveness.

D. Discussion and Summary

The four items that have been discussed in this chapter all reflected aspects of the program which the ExTFP guidelines required every applicant to take into account; therefore, it is important to consider rather carefully the pattern of results that we have just sketched out. Even though proposals for the ExTFP were required to show (1) how the program would build upon the backgrounds of experienced teachers, (2) that there would be significant cooperation between subject-matter and teacher-education departments, and (3) that a satisfactory balance would be achieved between instruction in subject matter and discussion of methods of teaching, the reports by fellows indicate that as many as 40% to 45% of the programs did not accomplish these objectives to any substantial degree.

When these objectives were not attained, the responsibility seems not to have rested principally with the intentions of the faculty and the director; indeed, the majority of faculty members and (especially) of directors reported that the objectives were actually achieved in their programs. But to take into account the background of one's students when a course is taught, one must know that background in detail, and this requires that the professor consult rather extensively with those students. To bring about true coordination of the activities of different professors who teach different courses, there must be joint planning and discussion by those professors before and during the academic term. Achieving some balance and continuity between subject-matter courses and those dealing with methods and procedures requires the coordinating activities of someone who knows what is going on in both areas. And the type of professional collaboration that is needed to attain those objectives is actively hindered by the attitudes and the mode of organization that characterizes contemporary American colleges and universities.

Thus, the professor's right to determine the content and method of instruction in his course has been defended insistently in American higher education, and with good reason; one consequence of this insistence is that faculty and administrators, alike, look with suspicion upon the suggestion that a student--experienced teacher or not--might be consulted about what should be covered in a course. As to cooperation among faculty members, divergent academic responsibilities place diverse demands upon individuals even within the same department; the divergence of demands is even greater among the staff from different departments.

It is not surprising, then, that in the actual operation of the ExTFP, faculty members were assigned courses to teach and were left alone to decide what and how they would be taught. In most institutions, ExTFP fellows took a core of courses in common. In every institution, the intention was to produce a coordinated, challenging, exciting, personally relevant educational experience for the experienced teacher. We have seen that most programs appear actually to have carried out remarkably effective programs. Nevertheless, the wisdom of the requirements that were built into the ExTFP guidelines is attested by the correlations that are presented in Table 6-6. Judgments by fellows of whether their background was utilized and of the coordination among the courses they took were very highly correlated with rated effectiveness; fellows' judgments of interdepartmental cooperation and of the relative emphasis upon subject matter and teaching methods, though less high, were consistently larger than would be expected by chance. It appears, then, that a more widespread accomplishment of the objectives set down in the guidelines would have promoted even greater general effectiveness in the ExTFP.

Chapter 7

Evaluation of Courses and Program Administration

We turn now to a central aspect of the fellows' experience in the ExTFP: their evaluation of the courses they took, the extent and disposition of the problems encountered in their program, and their relationships to the faculty and director. Especially in a program, such as this one, whose participants are involved in an organized and interrelated set of courses to be taken within a limited time, the quality of a student's experience must be affected remarkably by the quality of the courses he takes. A single course constitutes a sizeable fraction of his total work. Furthermore, each course is likely to be intimately related to many of the others, so that the success or failure of one may have repercussions throughout the entire program. In such a circumstance, the reaction of a student to an ineffectual course should by systematically affected by the extent to which he was able to influence the direction of that course while it was in progress by his ability to induce changes either in its content or in the manner in which it was taught. This power to influence educational content and practices, in turn, ought to depend upon the extent of communication between the fellows and the program's faculty and administration, as well as upon the administrative style and the institutional power of the program director. In the present chapter we will discuss the evaluations fellows made of their courses, respondents' judgments of the extent of problems in the program and of how those problems were handled, and reports of the kinds of relationships that obtained between fellows and faculty members.

A. Evaluation of Courses, Problems, and Relationships between Fellows and Staff

1. Evaluation of Courses

To obtain an indication of the effectiveness of their courses, fellows were asked to think of the best course in their program and to compare it to all of the other courses they had ever taken anywhere. Immediately afterward, they made the same comparison for the worst course in their program. Finally, they reported on how the remaining courses were distributed between the best and the worst.

Table 7-1. Evaluation by Fellows of Best and Worst Courses

Evaluation of Course	Percent of Judgments for Best and Worst Courses	
	Best Course	Worst Course
The very best I have ever taken	29.5	---
Among the top 10%, but not the best	48.5	3.2
Better than average	16.8	13.8
Below average	4.5	27.0
Among the worst 10%, but not the worst	0.3	33.0
The very worst I have ever taken	---	22.6
No Response	0.4	0.3

Responses to these items were both favorable and unfavorable to the level of instruction. On the one hand, about three fourths of the fellows reported that the best course in their program was among the top 10% of all those they had ever taken, with about 30% calling it the best ever. On the other hand, 55% reported that their worst course was in the lowest 10% of all they had ever taken, and 23% called it the worst ever. As to the distribution of the remaining courses (Table 7-2), just under half (45%) of the fellows said most of their other courses were fairly close or very close to the best, while fewer than one respondent in 12 (7.1%) reported that most were fairly close or very close to the worst.

Clearly, most of the courses fellows took were rated as good ones. Nevertheless, we wish to call attention to fellows' evaluations of their worst courses: over half of the fellows reported that they had taken at least one extremely bad course. Visits by evaluation teams to ExTFP institutions and the intensive study of three programs confirmed the fellows' observations that in more than a few schools fellows took one course or more that was deplorably bad. We do not believe that the incidence of inferior courses was unusually high in the ExTFP. Instead, it seems likely that the problem of inadequate instruction is one which American higher education as a whole will sooner or later have to resolve. We shall discuss this problem at length in Chapter 12.

Table 7-2. Evaluation of Courses Intermediate in Quality

How would you evaluate the remainder of your courses?	Percent of Judgments
Almost all very close to the best	9.4
Most fairly close to the best	35.9
Evenly spread between best and worst	46.8
Most fairly close to the worst	6.7
Almost all very close to the worst	0.4
No Response	0.9

2. Extent and Disposition of Problems

One conclusion from the study of the 1966-67 Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program was that the director at an institution could have a very great effect upon the program's success, depending upon how quickly and how effectively he dealt with the problems that arose during the year. In order to learn more about this process, it was decided to include in the 1967-68 questionnaire a variety of items which examined the extent of problems in the program and the manner in which they were handled. A rather complicated series of questions was developed to inquire into these issues. The questions began with one asking fellows and faculty to report on the magnitude of the problems that were met in the program, and to indicate whether action had been taken to remedy the problems. There followed, for fellows, a question in which they were asked to predict their program director's response to a hypothetical situation which involved a professor who was performing ineptly in the classroom. Faculty members and directors, for their part, were asked whether attempts had been made to alter the program in the light of fellows' dissatisfactions.

On all three questionnaires the first of these items began by remarking that in any program such as the ExTFP some problems and dissatisfactions are inevitable; it then asked how seriously the problems encountered in the respondent's program had interfered with the program's potential worth and effectiveness. Among fellows, there was a considerable spread of responses over the five categories, with 36% saying that the problems interfered moderately or extremely with the program's worth and effectiveness and 39% saying that they interfered only slightly or not at all. Among faculty members, the corresponding figures were 18% and 57%; among directors, 11% and 65%.

Table 7-3. Report of Seriousness of Problems in ExTFP Programs

How seriously did problems interfere with the worth and effectiveness of the program?	Fellows	Faculty	Directors
Extremely seriously	7.5	1.3	0.0
Moderately seriously	28.2	17.0	11.1
Somewhat	25.0	21.9	23.8
Slightly	20.6	34.8	28.6
Not at all	18.2	22.3	36.5
No Response	0.5	2.7	0.0

Respondents in all three roles were also asked whether the director was aware of the problems and to what extent the director and other faculty members tried to resolve those problems. Respondents in every role were agreed that the director was either moderately or very much aware of the problems (Table 7-4), the proportion of agreement ranging from 72% among the fellows to 98% among the directors. They were also agreed that the faculty (Table 7-5), and particularly the director (Table 7-6), had tried either moderately or very hard to resolve those problems; however, the fellows were less generous in their judgments on this topic than were those in the other groups: only 62% of the fellows, compared with 76% of the faculty and 94% of the directors, reported that the director tried moderately or very hard to resolve the problems.

Table 7-4. Reports of Director's Awareness of Problems

To what extent was the Director aware of these problems?	Fellows	Faculty	Directors
Very aware	43.8	57.6	66.7
Moderately aware	28.3	24.1	31.7
Somewhat aware	13.7	8.0	0.0
Slightly aware	9.2	2.7	0.0
Not aware at all	3.1	2.2	0.0
No Response	1.8	5.4	1.6

Table 7-5. Reports of Faculty's Attempts to Resolve Problems

How hard did the faculty, exclusive of the director, try to resolve these problems	Fellows	Faculty
Very hard	19.3	35.3
Moderately hard	28.9	34.4
Somewhat	23.7	14.7
Slightly	17.4	5.8
Not at all	9.4	5.8
No Response	1.3	4.0

Table 7-6. Reports of Director's Attempts to Resolve Problems

To what extent did the director try to resolve the problems?	Fellows	Faculty	Directors
Very hard	35.0	48.2	63.5
Moderately hard	27.0	28.1	30.2
Somewhat	15.6	8.9	3.2
Slightly	13.1	4.5	3.2
Not at all	7.1	3.6	0.0
No Response	2.2	6.7	0.0

Observation in the three programs that were studied intensively had suggested that some fellows were mistrustful of the director's allegiance, expecting that when problems did come to his attention he would be inclined not to accept the fellows' evaluation of their magnitude, would be disposed to do little or nothing about remedying them, or would even take sides against the fellows and with the faculty on contested issues. To ascertain the generality of this conception, fellows were asked a series of questions which centered around the following hypothetical situation: "Suppose that a problem arose around a course you were taking, in which you felt the professor was doing a very poor job. Would the director have been aware of the situation? Where would his allegiance have been? How much effort would he have made to resolve the problem at that time? Assuming he had made some efforts to resolve the problem, would he have been successful?"

Fellows were overwhelmingly of the opinion that the director would have become aware of the problem (79% said probably or definitely yes as against 21% reporting probably or definitely no). One fellow in three believed that the director's allegiance would have been with the faculty member, only 19% thought it would have been with the students, and 45% said he would have been impartial. Seventy-four percent believed the director would have worked moderately hard or very hard to resolve the problem at that time, while 23% said he would have made only slight effort or none at all. Finally, 70% of the fellows believed that the director probably or definitely had the power to resolve such a problem if he tried to do so.

To determine the faculty and directors' opinions about whether their institution had responded to fellows' dissatisfactions, they were asked how extensive the efforts had been to modify the program in response to such dissatisfactions. Both sets of respondents reported that their efforts had been considerable: 73% of the faculty and 82% of the directors reported that moderate or major changes in the program had been attempted in response to student dissatisfaction.

Table 7-7. Fellows' Reports of Directors' Behavior in Hypothetical Problem

Question	% of Fellows Responding
Would the director have known about the problem?	
Definitely yes	44.4
Probably yes	34.3
Probably no	17.7
Definitely no	2.9
No Response	0.7
Where would his allegiance have been?	
Definitely with faculty member	7.0
More with faculty than with students	26.4
Would have been impartial	44.9
More with student than with faculty	15.5
Definitely with students	3.2
No Response	2.2
How much effort would he have made to resolve the problem at that time?	
Would have worked very hard	39.9
Moderate effort	34.8
Slight effort	17.9
No effort at all	5.2
No Response	2.2
Assuming he had made some effort to resolve the problem, would he have been successful?	
Definitely yes	12.7
Probably yes	57.2
Probably no	25.4
Definitely no	1.8
No Response	2.9

Table 7-8. Faculty and Directors' Reports of Modifications in Program

Were efforts made to modify the program in response to fellows' dissatisfactions?	Faculty	Directors
Major changes were attempted	17.4	31.7
Moderate changes were attempted	55.4	49.2
Slight changes were attempted	14.7	17.5
No changes were attempted	4.9	1.6
No Response	7.6	0.0

To sum up, it was rather common for fellows to report that problems had arisen which interfered with the worth and effectiveness of their programs: fewer than 40% said such problems interfered with effectiveness very little or not at all. The majority of fellows reported that the director was aware of these problems and had tried to resolve them. Similarly, most fellows reported that the director would have known about and tried to resolve the problem of a professor who was doing a bad job. That there was some tension between many fellows and their program director, however, is suggested by the fact that a substantial minority (35%) showed rather little satisfaction with the director's attempts to resolve existing problems and that 33% felt that the director's sympathies would have been with the incompetent faculty member. Faculty members and directors were much more sanguine than the fellows about the extent and disposition of problems within the program.

3. Relations between Fellows and Faculty

Of obvious relevance to the question of how problems in the program were met is the pattern of relationships that existed between fellows and faculty. The first of a series of questions that was directed at this topic asked respondents whether the relationship between fellows and faculty was more nearly teacher-student or colleague-colleague. This was followed by questions which asked about the accessibility of the faculty and the director, whether the faculty and director were interested in the ExTFP fellows, and the helpfulness of the faculty and the director.

Fellows reported, by more than a two-to-one majority, that the relationship between fellows and faculty was more nearly teacher-student than colleague-colleague. Faculty members and directors, for their part, were much less likely to view the relationship as one of teacher and student: the preponderance of teacher-student over colleague-colleague reports was only 55-45 among faculty members and 51-49 among program directors. As to the comparison of the observed relationship with their initial hopes, half of the fellows and three fourths of the faculty and directors reported that the relationship was about what they expected. It is interesting to note that in each group most of the remaining respondents said that the relationship was more nearly a teacher-student one than they had hoped.

Table 7-9. Reported Relationship between Fellows and Faculty

Describe the relationship between fellows and faculty members.	Fellows 1967-68	Faculty 1967-68	Directors 1967-68
Definitely teacher-student	25.4	13.0	11.1
More nearly teacher-student	43.8	42.0	39.7
More nearly colleague-colleague	27.6	41.5	46.0
Definitely colleague-colleague	2.6	3.5	3.2
No Response	0.6	0.0	0.0
How does this compare with what you had hoped would be the relationship?			
Much more teacher-student	16.3	4.0	4.8
Somewhat more teacher-student	13.5	13.4	14.3
About what was expected	50.1	73.2	77.8
Somewhat more colleague-colleague	13.9	7.1	3.2
Much more colleague-colleague	5.7	1.3	0.0
No Response	0.5	0.9	0.0

As to the accessibility of faculty members and directors, almost 90% of the fellows said that the faculty members were either usually or always accessible, while 85% gave the same report for the program directors. Among the faculty and directors, themselves, 95% said they were usually or always accessible to the fellows.

Table 7-10. Reported Accessibility of Faculty and Director

How would you describe the faculty, excluding the director, and the director himself, as to their accessibility?	Ratings of Faculty		Ratings of Directors	
	by Fellows	by Faculty	by Fellows	by Directors
Always accessible	25.0	27.3	39.2	22.2
Usually accessible	64.5	67.0	45.4	73.0
Seldom accessible	9.7	5.3	13.9	4.8
Never accessible	0.2	0.0	0.8	0.0
No Response	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.0

Similarly, judgments of the interest of faculty members and directors in the ExTFP fellows were uniformly high. Among fellows, 82% reported that the faculty members were moderately or very interested in the fellows, while 87% gave the same report about the directors. The corresponding proportions were even higher in the other two groups: 97% of the faculty and 100% of the directors reported that they were either moderately or very interested in the fellows.

Table 7-11. Reported Interest of Faculty and Director

How would you describe the faculty, excluding the director, and the director himself, as to interest in ExTFP fellows	Ratings of Faculty		Ratings of Directors	
	by Fellows	by Faculty	by Fellows	by Directors
Very interested	42.5	63.4	64.5	85.7
Moderately interested	39.3	33.9	22.6	14.3
Slightly interested	14.6	1.8	9.4	0.0
Not at all interested	2.3	0.4	2.1	0.0
Actively antagonistic	0.7	0.0	0.7	0.0
No Response	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.9

Finally, fellows were overwhelmingly of the opinion that the faculty and the program directors were usually or always helpful to them. Such judgments were made about the faculty members by 90% of the fellows and about the directors by 85%.

Table 7-12. Reported Helpfulness of Faculty and Director

How would you describe the faculty, excluding the director, and the director himself, as to their helpfulness?	Ratings by Fellows	
	of Faculty	of Directors
Always helpful	34.5	50.2
Usually helpful	55.3	35.0
Seldom helpful	9.2	12.4
Never helpful	0.4	1.5
No Response	0.6	0.9

In short, the vast majority of fellows reported that their relation to the faculty was more teacher-student than colleague-colleague; a substantial minority (30%) had hoped for a relationship closer to colleague-colleague. Nevertheless, over 80% of the fellows reported that the faculty and directors were interested in them, were accessible, and were helpful.

B. Correlations among Evaluation of Courses and Reports of Program Administration

To facilitate the presentation of the correlations among the nineteen items that are discussed in this chapter, we will first present the correlations among items grouped under a common heading and then those between items that are grouped under separate headings. Consider, first, the fellows' evaluations of their courses. Correlations among these items were substantial and positive. Fellows who made very favorable judgments of their best course tended, also, to make relatively favorable judgments of their poorest course and to report that the balance of their courses were similar in quality to the best one.

Table 7-13. Correlations among Fellows' Evaluations of Courses

Item	1	2	3
1. How good was your best course?	---	.45	.72
2. How bad was your worst course?		---	.67
3. How were the others distributed?			---

As to reports of the extent and disposition of problems, the judgments by fellows on these eight items were very highly intercorrelated: the average of the 28 correlations was .53, and all but 3 of the 28 differed significantly from zero. It is instructive to examine which of these items was correlated with judgments on the first one, the one dealing with the magnitude of problems in the program. Fellows who said that such problems interfered relatively seriously with the success of their program (a) were less likely to report that the faculty and director had tried to resolve the problems, (b) were more likely to report that the director's allegiance in the hypothetical case would be with the faculty member instead of the fellows, and (c) were less optimistic about the director's power to resolve the hypothetical problem if he tried to do so. Note that fellows' reports of the seriousness of such problems did not correlate significantly with either of the items that asked about the director's awareness of problems. The significant correlations were with the actions that the director would take and the nature of his allegiance when problems arose, not with his awareness of the problems.

It is also of interest that the two items which correlated most consistently with others in this set were those asking whether the director would try to resolve the problems.

Table 7-14. Correlations among Reports of the Seriousness and Disposition of Problems

		Fellows' Responses								Faculty Responses				
	Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	9
Fellows' Responses	1. Extent of problems	---		-.57	-.55		.49	-.53	-.48	$\boxed{.53}$				
	2. Was director aware?		---	.59	.76	.77	- 43	.50				.30		.28
	3. Did faculty try to resolve problems?			---	.77	.49	-.41	.68	.53					
	4. Did director try to resolve problems?				---	.72	-.63	.81	.42					
	5. Would director know of hypothetical problem?					---	-.51	.57	.26					
	6. Director's allegiance						---	-.70	-.31					
	7. Would director try to resolve problem?							---	.66	-.27				
	8. Would he succeed?								---					
Faculty Responses	1. Extent of problems									---		.36		
	2. Was director aware?										---		.64	.42
	3. Did faculty try to resolve problems?											---		.45
	4. Did director try to resolve problems?												---	.51
	9. Was program changed?													---

Fellows who reported that the director of their program had worked very hard on the problems that arose and would work very hard on the hypothetical problem also reported that the problems were less disruptive, that the director would be aware of them, that his allegiance would not be with the faculty member against the student, that he would probably be able to resolve the hypothetical problem, and that other faculty members in their program had also tried to resolve the problems.

The pattern of correlations among faculty responses was less consistent, though five of the 10 correlations differed significantly from zero. Where the faculty reported that the program had been changed in response to fellows' dissatisfactions, they also said the director was aware of the problems and that he and the faculty had tried to resolve them.

Of the 40 correlations between fellows' judgments of the extent and disposition of problems and similar judgments by faculty members, only four differed significantly from zero. Of these four, the only one of substantial magnitude was between fellows' and faculty judgments of the extent of problems in the program. In other words, although respondents in the two roles were in substantial agreement concerning the magnitude of problems in the different institutions, there was no appreciable correspondence between the two sets of judgments about staff awareness of the problems nor about the actions that had been taken to try to eliminate whatever problems arose.

Correlations among fellows' reports of their relationship with the faculty and director were also quite high. Institutions where fellows reported that their relation to the faculty was more teacher-student than colleague-colleague were also those whose fellows reported that the relationship had been more formal than they had hoped, and that the faculty and director were relatively inaccessible to them, relatively uninterested in them, and relatively unhelpful. None of the 32 correlations between judgments by fellows and those by faculty members differed significantly from zero, and only one correlation among the judgments of faculty members achieved statistical significance. Doubtless, this lack of correlation reflects the extreme favorableness of faculty responses to these items; as was discussed earlier, the correlation between two variables is greatly diminished when the range of responses to one is restricted.

Table 7-16 presents the correlations between these three subsets of items. It will be noted that correlations among fellows' responses were quite high: of the 112 correlation coefficients, 109 differed significantly from zero and 50 were greater than .50. Such high correlations among responses to items which ostensibly reflect different areas of content must be examined carefully before they are interpreted as yielding information about the real world, rather than information about how individuals respond to attitude questionnaires. Results of this type often reflect the operation of a "halo effect," in which respondents take the favorable or unfavorable pole of each item not so much out of conviction about the content of the items as out of their general positive or negative orientation to the larger situation. It would not be surprising if an effect of this sort were operating in the present study. However, two considerations argue

Table 7-15. Correlations among Reported Relationship between Fellows and Staff

	Item	Fellows' Judgments								Faculty Judgments			
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	5
Fellows' Judgments	1. Relation between fellows and faculty	---	.77	-.43	-.35	-.58	-.46	-.47	-.34	☐			
	2. How did relation correspond to your hopes?		---	-.52	-.38	-.60	-.50	-.56	-.44		☐		
	3. Faculty accessibility			---	.55	.70	.44	.74	.48			☐	
	4. Director's accessibility				---	.45	.78	.50	.80				
	5. Faculty interest					---	.55	.82	.47				☐
	6. Director's interest						---	.59	.88				
	7. Faculty helpfulness							---	.67				
	8. Director's helpfulness								---				
Faculty Judgments	1. Relation between fellows and faculty									---	.24		
	2. How did relation correspond to your hopes										---		
	3. Faculty accessibility											---	
	5. Faculty interest												---

Table 7-16. Correlations between Evaluations of Courses, Reports of the Extent and Disposition of Problems, and Perceived Relationships between Fellows and Staff

			Courses			Relations Between Fellows and Staff											
			Fellows' Reports			Fellows' Reports								Faculty Reports			
			Evaluation of best course	Evaluation of worst course	Distribution of other courses	Relation between fellows and faculty	How did relation correspond to your hopes?	Faculty accessibility	Director's accessibility	Faculty interest	Director's interest	Faculty helpfulness	Director's helpfulness	Relation between fellows and faculty	How did relation correspond to your hopes?	Faculty accessibility	Faculty interest
Courses	Fellows' Reports	Evaluation of best course	Reported in			-.35	-.38	.24	.40	.40	.40	.43	.46				
		Evaluation of worst course	Table 7-13			-.46	-.56	.24	.32	.46	.48	.52	.46				
		Distribution of others				-.42	-.47	.29	.36	.52	.49	.57	.49				
Relations between Fellows and Staff	Fellows' Reports	Extent of problems	-.64	-.55	-.67	.48	.56	-.51	-.51	-.59	-.56	-.70	-.62				
		Director awareness	.30	.35	.40	-.30	-.37		.44	.34	.58		.45				
		Faculty effort to resolve	.44	.53	.55	-.56	-.64	.43	.40	.72	.58	.62	.52				
		Director effort to resolve	.47	.52	.54	-.50	-.57	.35	.68	.51	.86	.54	.81				
		Director know hypoth. prob.	.30	.27	.34	-.32	-.37	.26	.55	.34	.66	.32	.56		-.29		
		Allegiance	-.51	-.38	-.47	.40	.41		-.57	-.33	-.66	-.35	-.57				
		Would he try to resolve?	.48	.50	.55	-.51	-.53	.44	.63	.66	.79	.62	.76				
		Would he succeed?	.41	.36	.46	-.36	-.34	.48	.30	.66	.38	.60	.41				
	Faculty Reports	Extent of problems					.24		-.33	-.26	-.32	-.30	-.40	-.26		.24	.24
		Director awareness														-.26	
		Faculty effort to resolve															
		Director effort to resolve															
		Was program changed?															

against accepting such an effect as the only, or even the principal determinant of the present results. For one thing, our field observations strongly suggest that these items refer to processes which were distinct yet closely interdependent in the actual operation of programs. In addition, a detailed analysis of the actual pattern of correlations among individual items suggests that the fellows were responding differentially to these questions. Let us first discuss the pattern of correlations in detail.

In examining these correlations, our interest is in whether some items in each set show consistently high correlations with those from other sets, and whether a study of the consistent pattern of correlations helps us to achieve a sensible understanding of the determinants of fellows' reactions to their experience in the ExTFP. If such is the case, we will be less prone to dismiss the results as indicating simply the operation of a halo effect.

A close perusal of Table 7-16 shows that certain relationships were very strong. Thus, (1) Fellows' ratings of the director's interest in them and his helpfulness were strongly related to their judgments of the extent and disposition of problems in the program. (2) Those programs whose fellows reported that the director tried hard to resolve program problems tended also to be those in which fellows reported more favorable relationships between themselves and the staff. (3) Fellows' evaluations of their courses were relatively highly correlated with their judgments of the interest and helpfulness of the director and other faculty members, and with their reports that the staff tried to resolve the problems that arose during the year.

On the other hand, some items showed only moderate correlations with the others, though such correlations were usually significantly different from zero: (1) Fellows' ratings of the faculty's accessibility provided relatively low correlations with their judgments of the extenr and disposition of problems and with their evaluation of courses. (2) Reports of the director's awareness of the problems--as distinct from the actions he took to resolve them--showed relatively low correlations with judgments of the relationship between fellows and staff and with evaluations of the courses. (3) Judgments of the director's power to effect changes in the institution did not correlate highly with ratings of his accessibility, but did correlate quite strongly with reports of the faculty's interest in and helpfulness to the fellows.

In short, the correlations among fellows' responses to these items were not uniformly high. Instead, they presented a pattern in which some pairs of items were very highly correlated, other pairs were moderately correlated, and still other pairs were uncorrelated.

The pattern of these correlations is supported by less quantitative observations. Such observations are available from visits by evaluation teams during the 1966-67 program, from an intensive study of three institutions during the 1967-68 academic year, and from extensive, though less formally structured observations of the operation of a number of other programs during those two years and in 1968-69. The conclusions from these observations may be summarized as follows: In the operation of the ExTFP, problems frequently arose which affected all or most of the fellows in much the same way. Sometimes such problems grew out of program requirements which the fellows deemed unrealistic; sometimes the program or some of its courses seemed irrelevant to the needs and interests of experienced teachers; often one or more courses were poorly taught or of little value and interest to the fellows. Because of the *en bloc* organization of ExTFP programs, when such problems arose they not only affected all of the fellows alike, they were the topic of extended and intense discussion among fellows. There frequently developed group-shared interpretations of the cause of the problem, and a commonly-held antagonism toward one person or another. Not uncommonly, there developed strong feelings of resentment, of being unjustly treated. Almost always, the program director and other staff members eventually learned about such problems. How soon this happened varied, of course, with the nature of the problem and with the director's relationship to the fellows. Whether actions were taken to alleviate the problem, and the outcome of such actions, largely determined the long-range effects of the problem upon the fellows' satisfaction with the program.

The implication of these results for the organization and administration of future programs like the ExTFP will be discussed at some length later in this report, so this topic need not be pursued here. However, it is important to call attention to the relative lack of correlation of any of the fellows' judgments on these items with judgments by faculty members. It seems likely that these low correlations reflected in good part the overwhelmingly favorable judgments by faculty members on many of the items discussed in this section. The low correlations also suggest that although fellows in a given program tended to arrive at some degree of consensus on these issues, their views, if unfavorable to the program, were not shared by the staff members. Whatever the reason, it is clear that the only item for which judgments by faculty members were systematically related to those of fellows from the same program involved faculty ratings of the extent of problems in the program: those institutions in which faculty reported the problems were minimal were those in which fellows reported that relationships between themselves and the staff were relatively good, and *vice versa*.

C. Correlations with Measures of Effectiveness, Morale, and Coordination of Program Components

Since the correlations among judgments of program effectiveness and of morale and solidarity were so strongly positive, it will not be necessary to present the separate correlations between all of the items discussed in this chapter and the individual measures of effectiveness and morale. Instead, Table 7-17 presents, for responses by fellows, the average correlation of the variables discussed in this chapter with effectiveness measures

Table 7-17. Correlations of Fellows' Evaluation of Courses, Reports of Problems, and Perceived Relationship to Staff with Measures of Effectiveness and Morale

			Fellows' Judgments		Faculty Judgments	
			Effectiveness	Morale	Effectiveness	Morale
Fellows' Judgments	Courses	Evaluation of best course	.61	.44		
		Evaluation of worst course	.56	.38		
		Distribution of other courses	.68	.47		
		Average, course evaluations	.62	.43	.20	.12
	Extent and disposition of problems	Extent of problems	-.64	-.63	-.31	-.34
		Director awareness of problems	.44			
		Faculty effort to resolve problems	.59	.40		
		Director effort to resolve problems	.56	.37		
		Director know hypothetical problem	.39	.28		
		Director's allegiance	-.44	-.30		
		Would he try to resolve problem?	.56	.35	.25	
		Would he be successful	.46	.39		
		Average, extent of problems	.51	.36	.17	.13
	Relation to Staff	Relation between fellows and staff	-.46	-.50		-.26
		How did this compare to hopes?	-.52	-.47		-.26
		Faculty accessibility	.37	.38		
		Director's accessibility	.58	.48	.24	
		Faculty interest	.57	.47	.26	
		Director's interest	.42	.34		
		Faculty helpfulness	.50	.38	.25	
		Director's helpfulness	.52	.38		
		Average, relation to staff	.49	.42	.20	.16

and with reported morale.

It is clear from Table 7-17 that responses by fellows to the 19 items presented in this chapter correlated significantly with most of their judgments of program effectiveness, morale, and coordination. Nevertheless, the magnitude of the correlations varied from item to item, so it will be useful to examine the pattern of these relationships in some detail.

Consider first the correlations with program effectiveness. Fellows' evaluations of their courses, their reports of the extent and disposition of problems, and their perception of the relationship between fellows and staff all correlated significantly with the measures of effectiveness. The highest of these correlations involved the evaluation of the best course, evaluation of those courses between the best and the worst, and judgments of the severity of program problems. The lowest correlations involved the director's interest in fellows, his awareness of problems, and the faculty's accessibility.

Correlations of fellows' responses to these items with measures of morale were somewhat lower than their correlations with measures of effectiveness. Nevertheless, 18 of the 19 average correlations were significantly different from zero. The largest of these involved judgments of the severity of program problems; the smallest involved reports of the director's awareness of problems and predictions of his allegiance in the hypothetical problem.

Finally, Table 7-17 shows that the correlations were spotty between fellows' evaluations of courses, their ratings of the extent of problems, and their reports on fellow-faculty relationships, on the one hand, and faculty judgments of effectiveness and morale. None of the fellows' evaluations of courses correlated consistently with such faculty judgments. Fellows' judgments of the severity of the problems in the program did correlate inversely with faculty ratings of effectiveness and of fellows' morale.

There is a striking difference between the magnitude of the correlations in Table 7-17--which was restricted to fellows' reports of course quality, problems, and fellow-faculty relations--and the size of correlations in Table 7-18, which deals with faculty reports of problems and fellow-faculty relations. Only faculty ratings of the severity of problems in their program were correlated with judgments by fellows and by faculty of morale; other correlations were small and showed no consistent pattern.

Table 7-18. Correlations of Faculty Evaluations of Courses, Reports of Problems, and Perceived Relationship to Staff with Measures of Effectiveness and Morale

			Fellows' Judgments		Faculty Judgments	
			Effectiveness	Morale	Effectiveness	Morale
Faculty Judgments	Extent of Problems	Extent of problems		-.36		-.35
		Director awareness of problems				
		Faculty effort to resolve problems				
		Director effort to resolve problems				
		Was the program changed?				
		Average, extent of problems	.10	.11	.14	.17
	Relation to Fellows	Relations between fellows and staff				
		How did this compare to hopes?				
		Faculty accessibility				
		Faculty interest				
		Average, relation to fellows	.10	.10	.11	.12

D. Summary

In the main, fellows' ratings of the quality of their better courses were favorable. Their best course was reported to be extremely good, and most fellows said the majority of their courses were nearer in quality to their best one than to their worst one. Nevertheless, a considerable proportion of the respondents reported that at least one course was extremely ineffective; we shall argue in Chapter 12 that this condition probably characterizes the experience of the majority of students in American colleges and universities today. Fellows' evaluations of the quality of their courses were strongly correlated with judgments of effectiveness and with most of their reports of the extent of problems in their program and of the relationships between fellows and faculty. Such correlations were especialy high with reports that the faculty and directors had tried to resolve problems which arose; on the other hand, fellows' evaluations of their courses did not correlate highly with their reports of the accessibility of faculty members and directors.

Problems of some sort are almost inevitable in any educational program. About a third of the fellows reported that such problems interfered substantially with the success of their program; conversely, 40% said such problems interfered with success very little or not at all. Most of the fellows reported that their directors had tried to resolve these problems, and that the director probably would have been able to resolve a hypothetical problem had he tried to do so. Faculty members, and especially directors, were even more likely than fellows to say that the faculty and staff had been aware of problems when they arose and had tried to resolve them. Fellows' judgments about the extent and disposition of problems in the program were highly intercorrelated, though two items--both having to do with the director's awareness of the problems rather than his willingness to act-showed somewhat lower correlations than did the others.

As to the perceived relationships between fellows and faculty members, 70% of the fellows said it was more nearly teacher-student than colleague-colleague; however, the great majority of fellows reported that the faculty and director were accessible, interested in the fellows, and helpful to them. Self-reports by the faculty and directors on these items were even more one-sided than the judgments of fellows. Again, the intercorrelations among fellows' responses to these items were very high.

On all three sets of items, fellows' reports were consistently related to their judgments of program effectiveness and of fellows' morale. Within this overall pattern of high positive correlations, fellows' perception of the director's awareness of problems was less highly correlated with effectiveness and morale than were fellows' judgments of the kinds of actions the director would take to alleviate problems. Apparently mere awareness of problems was not enough. Effective programs, with high morale among fellows, were those whose fellows believed that the director would initiate direct and successful actions to relieve problems when they arose.

Faculty reports of the seriousness of problems in their program correlated inversely with their own and fellows' judgments of morale. Otherwise, faculty reports on the disposition of problems or the relationships between fellows and staff did not correlate systematically with ratings of effectiveness or morale.

Chapter 8

Operating Strategies

Institutions were required by the Office of Education to introduce some coordination between subject-matter and teacher training departments and to make some provision for the utilization of fellows' background in the conduct of the program. However, there were a variety of aspects of the organization of programs for which no official guidelines were provided. Among such considerations were decisions as to whether the content of the program should be innovative or relatively traditional, whether or not participants could receive a graduate degree at the end of the academic year, how much competition among fellows should be built into the program, and how heavy a work load should be required of the fellows. Decisions as to these matters were left up to the institutions which sponsored the program. In the present chapter we will examine the reports by fellows and faculty of the nature of those decisions, and the relationship of the institutions' decisions to other aspects of the program's operation.

A. The Nature of the Operating Strategies

1. Innovativeness

Fellows, faculty members, and directors in all institutions were asked: "Many programs were intended to be innovative, others were largely traditional. Which was the case in your program?" Examination of the responses shows that about the same proportion of fellows, faculty, and directors asserted that their program was innovative throughout--the proportion of such responses ranged from 17% of the fellows to 23% of the faculty. However, the fellows were much more prone than the faculty and directors to report that their programs had few or no innovative aspects: about one-third of the fellows, but only 8% of the faculty and 3% of the directors, reported that their program fell on the non-innovative side of the continuum.

Table 8-1. Reported Innovativeness of ExTFP Programs

How innovative was your program?	Fellows 1967-68	Faculty 1967-68	Directors 1967-68
Innovative throughout	16.8	23.2	20.6
Some aspects were innovative	49.4	67.4	76.2
A few aspects were innovative	26.2	7.1	3.2
No aspects were innovative	7.2	0.4	0.0
No Response	0.4	1.8	0.0

2. Competition and Work Load

By all accounts the fellows in most programs were faced with a substantial work load. Only 12% of the fellows reported that the load was too heavy to permit completion of assignments; nevertheless, another 50% reported that it was heavier than desirable, while only 36% reported that it was about right, and a scant 2% called the work load too light. Faculty members and directors were more inclined than fellows to call the work load about right--57% gave that response; nevertheless, about 40% of each group said that it was in some degree too heavy, and fewer than 2% said it was too light.

Table 8-2. Reported Work Load

What was the fellows' schedule and work load?	Fellows 1967-68	Faculty 1967-68	Directors 1967-68
Too heavy for completion of work	11.5	5.4	1.6
Heavier than desirable	50.4	34.8	39.7
About right	35.8	57.1	57.1
Too light	2.1	1.8	1.6
No Response	0.2	0.9	0.0

In reporting upon the level of competition in their program, respondents first estimated the amount of competition that existed and then evaluated the effects of the competition upon the performance of the group and, in the case of the fellows, upon the respondents themselves. Of the fellows, 51% said that competition was at either quite a high level or an extremely high level, a considerable reduction from the 61% who gave the same response the previous year. A smaller proportion of faculty members and directors than of fellows reported a substantial degree of competition among fellows in their programs (44% and 42%, respectively).

Table 8-3. Reports of Level of Competition

How much competition was there among fellows for grades, prestige, and recognition?	Fellows 1966-67	Fellows 1967-68	Faculty 1967-68	Directors 1967-68
Extremely high level	27.4	21.6	11.6	9.5
Quite high level	33.3	29.2	32.1	31.7
Moderate level	30.8	30.2	39.7	39.7
Quite low level	5.1	11.5	12.5	11.1
Very low level	2.6	7.2	2.7	7.9
No Response	0.9	0.3	1.3	0.0

After judging the level of competition in their program, fellows who reported a noticeable level were asked to indicate its effect upon their own ability to benefit from the program as well as upon the fellows as a group. Faculty members were asked to evaluate the effects of the competition upon the fellows as a group. In their judgments of the effects of the competition upon themselves, about 35% of the fellows said they were beneficial while only 19% believed them to be disruptive to some degree. On the other hand, more fellows reported that the competition was disruptive to the group than reported that it was beneficial (35% as against 26%). Faculty members and directors were more likely than were fellows to report that the effects were beneficial to the group (41% of the faculty and 33% of the directors) than that they were disruptive (16% of the faculty and 22% of the directors).

Table 8-4. Judgments of the Effects of Competition

How did the level of competition in the program affect the fellows' performance?	Fellows (effects on self)	Fellows (effects on group)	Faculty	Directors
Very beneficial, stimulated achievement	7.6	4.0	8.9	4.8
Probably good, pushed to greater efforts	27.3	22.1	32.1	28.6
No noticeable effects	14.4	7.0	4.5	7.9
Somewhat disruptive	12.0	30.3	15.6	20.6
Very disruptive, grades were the goal	7.0	4.8	0.9	1.6
No Response	31.6	31.8	38.0	36.5

3. The Achievement of Graduate Degrees

Fellows were asked whether they, themselves, expected to receive an advanced degree by the time the program ended, and also to estimate the proportion of fellows in their program who would receive such degrees. Faculty members and directors were asked to estimate the proportion in their programs who would receive advanced degrees.

Table 8-5. Estimates of the Proportion of Fellows to Receive Advanced Degrees

What proportion of the fellows in your program will receive an advanced degree?	Fellows	Faculty	Directors
All or nearly all	64.4	60.3	74.6
About three fourths	10.6	13.8	14.3
About half	9.8	8.9	6.3
About one fourth	4.4	5.8	1.6
None or nearly none	7.8	5.4	1.6
No Response	3.0	5.8	1.6

It should be noted that very few of the directors reported that none of the fellows would receive advanced degrees. This reflects the fact that such degrees were offered by all but two or three of the programs that operated in 1967-68. In fact, 75% of the fellows and faculty members reported that three fourths or more of those in their programs would receive such degrees; a judgment with which 89% of the directors agreed. About three fourths of the fellows also reported that they, themselves, would definitely or almost certainly receive an advanced degree.

Do you expect to receive an advanced degree at the end of your program?

Definitely	47.0
Almost certainly	24.8
Probably	7.4
Somewhat uncertain	4.3
I doubt it	1.3
Definitely not	12.8
No Response	2.3

B. Correlation among Aspects of Operating Strategies

Clearly there is little common content among these four sets of questions-- the degree of innovativeness of the programs, their level of competition, the magnitude of fellows' work load, and the proportion who would receive advanced degrees. This being the case, one might expect high correlations among items in the same set, but rather low correlations between items from different sets. It is clear from Table 8-6 that such was the case. Fellows' reports on the three items having to do with the level of competition were all correlated significantly with one another, and the fellows' two estimates of the likelihood that they and their colleagues would receive an advanced degree were very highly correlated. However, the only item on the fellows' questionnaire that correlated consistently with others from different content areas was the reported innovativeness of the program: programs which were rated as innovative by their fellows tended also to be rated as noncompetitive and as productive of advanced degrees.

The only significant correlations between fellows' reports and those by faculty members involved responses to items from the same sets. Thus, fellows and faculty members tended to agree on the degree of innovativeness in their program, the magnitude of the work load, the proportion of fellows who would receive advanced degrees, and the level of competition in the program. It is of interest that even though there was a significant correlation between fellows' judgments of the level of competition and judgments by faculty members on the same item, the judgments of the two groups as to the effects of that competition upon the fellows did not correlate significantly.

Table 8-6. Correlations among Aspects of Operating Strategies

			Fellows' Reports							Faculty Reports				
					Competition			Advanced Degree				Competi-tion		
			Innovativeness	Work load	Level	Effects on self	Effects on group	Own chances	% of group	Innovativeness	Work load	Level	Effect on group	% advanced degree
Fellows' Reports		Innovativeness	---		-.24	.30	.25	.31	.27	.46				
		Work load		---			-.24				.36			
	Com-peti-tion	Level			---	-.42	-.54					.39		
		Effect on self				---	.86							
		Effect on group					---						☐	
	Ad-vanced Degree	Own chances						---	.95					.64
		% of group							---	.25				.67
Faculty Reports		Innovativeness								---				.33
		Work load									---			
	Com-peti-tion	Level										---	.33	
		Effect on group											---	
		% advanced degree												---

C. Correlations of Operating Strategies with Measures of Effectiveness and Morale

Table 8-7 presents the correlations between reports of aspects of operating strategy and judgments of morale and effectiveness. It is clear that fellows' ratings of the innovativeness of their programs correlated significantly with their own average judgments on both effectiveness and morale. Faculty ratings of innovativeness also correlated with fellows' ratings of morale.

Neither fellows' nor faculty judgments of magnitude of the work load correlated significantly with their reports of program effectiveness and morale.

Table 8-7. Correlations between Aspects of Operating Strategy and Measures of Effectiveness and Morale

			Fellows' Reports		Faculty Reports	
			Effectiveness	Morale	Effectiveness	Morale
Fellows' Reports		Innovativeness	.44	.37		
		Work load				
	Competition	Level		-.27		
		Effect on self	.33	.46		
		Effect on group	.30	.50		
	Advanced Degree	Own chances				
		% of group				
Faculty Reports		Innovativeness		.25		
		Work load				
	Competition	Level				
		Effect on group			.27	
		% advanced degree	.25	.26		.25

Fellows' ratings of the absolute level of competition in the program did not correlate highly and consistently with effectiveness and morale. However, fellows' judgments of the effects of the competition upon themselves and their colleagues were consistently correlated with those measures: programs in which the effects of competition were perceived by fellows to be disruptive had lower morale and were reported to be less effective. Faculty judgments of the level and effects of competition, however, did not correlate consistently with effectiveness and morale.

Finally, fellows' reports of the likelihood of advanced degrees being given in their program did not correlate significantly with effectiveness and morale; however, there were consistently significant average correlations between faculty reports of a high probability of degrees being given in their program and fellows' judgments of effectiveness and morale.

D. Summary

Previous chapters have provided us with a considerable number of items to which fellows' responses varied congruently, and which were consistently correlated with fellows' judgments of program effectiveness. To this list we now add fellows' judgments of the innovativeness of their program. This correlation is especially interesting because reports of innovativeness were not significantly correlated with judgments of effectiveness in the 1966-67 ExTFP study--one of the few differences between the patterns of correlation in the two investigations. The reasons for this difference, of course, are altogether unclear, so it will be important to examine once more the nature of the correlation in the 1968-69 program.

In the 1966-67 study, fellows' judgments of their work load were inversely correlated with their estimates of effectiveness, although their reports of the degree of competition in the programs were not. In the present study, reports of the magnitude of work did not correlate significantly with effectiveness and morale--a second difference between the results of the two studies.

As was true in the earlier study, reports of the absolute level of competition in the 1967-68 study did not correlate with judgments of effectiveness. However, fellows' reports of the effects of such competition did correlate with effectiveness and also with morale. It appears, then, that it is not so much the amount of competition among fellows that produces differences in their reactions to the program, but the context in which the competition takes place, and especially the effect it has upon the fellows' relationships to one another.

Fellows were specifically prohibited from receiving an advanced degree by the mode of organization of two or three of the ExTFP programs. In those institutions where advanced degrees could be attained, the overwhelming majority of the fellows were convinced by the end of the academic year, when they filled out this questionnaire, that they would receive such a degree. Their reports of their chances of receiving a degree did not correlate significantly with any of the other items in the questionnaire. It will be important to examine in the 1968-69 study whether the same pattern holds true for judgments made earlier in the academic year. It may be, for example, that programs whose fellows are in doubt about their chances of earning an advanced degree through much of the school year will have established a level of anxiety in the student group such that fellows' morale and satisfaction with the program will be permanently reduced.

Chapter 9

A Comparison of Education-Based and Noneducation-Based Programs

Programs may readily be grouped according to one or another relatively objective criterion, and the resultant subgroups can then be compared to one another as to the kinds of ratings their members received from participants. The present chapter presents the comparisons that were obtained by sorting programs into those that were administered in schools or departments of education and those administered in some other part of the institution. It is necessary to explain why we compared education and noneducation programs, for that is obviously not the only type of classification that would have yielded interesting and informative comparisions of programs. For example, one might divide programs for comparison according to their subject matter, according to the school level in which their participants taught, or according to whether they were located in large or small academic institutions; still other bases of classification, of equal or greater interest, may be generated with only a few minutes reflection. In considerable part, the decision to examine, for this report, the effects of locating a program in education or noneducation departments grew out of the continuing controversy over whether teacher training programs are more effective when administered by educationists or by specialists in one or another academic discipline; it seemed sensible to see whether the present data could provide information relevant to that controversy. In this connection, a preliminary analysis of the results of the 1966-67 study had shown that education-based programs received higher ratings for effectiveness than did those administered in noneducation programs; it seemed important to check that result in an additional sample.

To carry out these comparisons, the 68 institutions were divided into two groups: the 32 which were principally located in schools or departments of education, and the remaining 36. The 36 noneducation programs were administered, for the most part, in traditional academic departments of liberal arts schools, though some were in other locations such as fine arts, urban studies, or library science. The two groups were compared, first, as to the ratings of effectiveness they received from their fellows. When it became clear that education-based programs once more received higher effectiveness ratings from their fellows than did noneducation programs, two additional sets of analyses were performed. First, the two groups of programs were compared on all of the other items that we have discussed in the preceding chapters, to determine whether the differences between groups were general, or specific to judgments of effectiveness. Second, correlations between effectiveness and each of the other items were computed independently for education-based and noneducation-based programs to determine whether the pattern of relations between items held up in both types of programs.

A. Effectiveness and the Location of the Program

Table 9-1 presents the comparison of education-based and noneducation-based programs for the five fellows' ratings of effectiveness. It is apparent that education-based programs received higher ratings on all five of these items, as well as on a combined index consisting of the total of the five items.

A number of aspects of Table 9-1 should be considered. First, it is clear that the average ratings for the 36 noneducation programs were on the favorable side of neutral for every item, even though they were significantly less favorable than the ratings given to education-based programs. Second, though the differences between education-based and noneducation-based programs were small for every item, they were always in the same direction and, for every item, were greater in magnitude than would be expected by chance.[1] Finally, attention should be paid to the variation in magnitude of these differences from one item to another. Differences between education-based and noneducation-based programs were smallest in the ratings fellows made of participants' interest in the subject matter and in their evaluation of the program as a learning experience. The differences were greatest with respect to judgments of whether the program objectives were realistic and whether the program prepared fellows for their teaching situations. This outcome is clearly a sensible one. In both education-based and noneducation-based programs fellows were interested in their work and were able to learn a large body of material they had not previously known; programs based in departments or schools of education, however, were more likely to be oriented toward the practical problems of teachers and, hence, to assist ExTFP fellows with material directly relevant to their jobs.

---

[1] Four of these five items permitted respondents to choose from only four alternatives, while they chose from five alternatives on the remaining item. This dictated that the maximum difference between means was only three units for the first four items and only four units for the remaining item. When the possible range of scores is so restricted, small differences between means often become meaningful ones.

Table 9-1. Comparision of Fellows' Ratings of Effectiveness in Education-Based and Noneducation-Based ExTFP Institutions

Item	Location: Education	Location: Noneducation	Difference	Possible range of scores
Did the fellows seem genuinely interested in the subject matter of the program?	3.34	3.22	.12[2]	1-4
How stimulating and interesting was the program?	3.18	2.90	.28[1]	1-4
How well did the program prepare fellows for their own teaching situations?	3.31	2.92	.39[1]	1-4
How realistic and useful were the program objectives?	3.70	3.28	.42[1]	1-5
How would you rate the program as a learning experience?	3.72	3.58	.14[1]	1-4
Sum of five effectiveness ratings	17.25	15.90	1.35[1]	5-21

[1] Difference greater than would be expected by chance one time in 100.
[2] Difference greater than would be expected by chance one time in 20.

B. Morale and the Location of the Program

A comparison of education-based and noneducation-based programs in judgments of fellows' morale is presented in Table 9-2. On all four items, fellows in education-based programs reported significantly higher morale than did their counterparts in noneducation programs. Once more it should be pointed out that the ratings in noneducation-based institutions, though less favorable than those in education-based institutions, still were clearly on the favorable side of neutral.

Table 9-2. Comparison of Fellows' Ratings of Morale and Solidarity in Education-Based and Noneducation-Based Institutions

Item	Location		Difference	Possible range of scores
	Education	Noneducation		
How much group involvement was there in the fellows' interaction with each other?	3.94	3.58	.36[1]	1-5
Was there a feeling of group spirit and identity among fellows?	3.34	3.07	.27[1]	1-4
How would you rate the overall morale of participants?	3.68	3.32	.36[1]	1-5
How would you rate your own morale?	3.82	3.54	.28[2]	1-5

[1] Difference greater than would be expected by chance one time in 100.
[2] Difference greater than would be expected by chance one time in 20.

Since the two sets of institutions, those housed in education departments and those in other locations, differed in the same direction on both morale and rated effectiveness, it was necessary to determine whether the correlation between morale and effectiveness held up within the two types of programs. Accordingly, two sets of correlations were computed between the fellows' ratings on each of the four items dealing with morale, on the one hand, and the sum of the five effectiveness ratings on the other. These correlations are presented in Table 9-3.

Table 9-3. Correlations between Morale and Effectiveness, Computed Separately for Education-Based and Noneducation-Based ExTFP Institutions

Item	Location		Difference
	Education	Noneducation	
How much group involvement was there in the fellows' interaction with each other?	.57[1]	.13	.44[2]
Was there a feeling of group spirit and identity among fellows?	.51[1]	-.01	.52[2]
How would you rate the overall morale of participants?	.72[1]	.48[1]	.24
How would you rate your own morale?	.62[1]	.74[1]	-.08

[1] Correlation differs from zero at the .01 level of significance.
[2] Difference between correlations greater than would be expected by chance one time in 100.

Among the education-based programs, the correlations between effectiveness, on the one hand, and all four indices of morale and solidarity, on the other, were large and statistically significant. Among noneducation programs, significant correlations with effectiveness were obtained only for the two measures of morale; the correlations between effectiveness and the items that dealt with group spirit and group involvement were not significantly different from zero and were significantly smaller than the corresponding correlations in education-based programs.

In commenting upon the relatively low overall correlation between judgments of group solidarity and rated effectiveness, we remarked in Chapter 5 that a group of dissatisfied fellows might conceivably develop strong feelings of solidarity against a disliked administration while simultaneously experiencing relatively low morale. When such a situation obtained, it seems to have occurred in noneducation-based programs; the low correlations between solidarity and effectiveness in such programs show that solidary and non-solidary groups received high and low ratings on effectiveness in about the same proportion. In education-based programs, on the other hand, solidarity was almost as closely related to effectiveness as was morale.

C. Program Coordination and Location of the Program

Comparisons of the two sets of institutions with respect to fellows' judgments of program coordination are presented in Table 9-4. The two types of institutions differed significantly on all four items: fellows in education-based programs were more likely to report that the components of their program were well coordinated, that there was effective coordination between departments, and that their backgrounds were used effectively in the program; they were less likely to report that subject matter was emphasized at the expense of teaching methods. It should be noted that the average ratings in noneducation programs were (1) approximately at the neutral point in judgments of the coordination of program components, (2) somewhat on the unfavorable side of neutral in ratings of the extent to which the program built on fellows' backgrounds, and (3) markedly displaced from neutral toward judgments that subject matter was emphasized to the neglect of teaching methods.

Table 9-4. Comparison of Fellows' Ratings of Program Coordination in Education-Based and Noneducation-Based Institutions

Item	Location		Difference	Possible range of scores
	Education	Non-education		
How well were the components of your program coordinated with one another?	2.98	2.47	.51[1]	1-4
How well was the material in one department coordinated with that of others?	3.48	3.15	.33[1]	1-5
What was the relative emphasis upon subject matter and teaching methods?	3.23	3.74	-.51[1]	1-5
Did the program build upon fellows' backgrounds?	2.72	2.38	.34[1]	1-4

[1] Difference greater than would be expected by chance one time in 100.

As to the correlations between these responses and overall judgments of effectiveness, it will be seen in Table 9-5 that the pattern of correlations was quite similar for the two types of institutions, except for the item on the use of fellows' backgrounds. In both education-based and noneducation-based programs, there was a strong positive relationship between coordination of components and effectiveness, a moderate positive relationship between interdepartmental coordination and effectiveness, and a moderate inverse relationship between reported overemphasis of subject matter and effectiveness. In education-based programs, however, there was a very strong positive relationship between effectiveness and reports that fellows' backgrounds were utilized; the corresponding correlation in noneducation programs was positive but not significantly different from zero. It should be noted that this last difference is a sensible one. Education-based programs were designed to be more relevant than noneducation-based programs to the problems and concerns of teachers; whether such a program consistently built upon the fellows' background and experience had a marked bearing upon its effectiveness. In noneducation-based programs, on the other hand, a rather exciting and effective set of courses in some content area might or might not be directly relevant to the earlier experience of fellows in the program.

Table 9-5. Correlations between Program Coordination and Effectiveness, Computed Separately for Education-Based and Noneducation-Based Institutions

Item	Location		Difference
	Education	Noneducation	
How well were the components of your program coordinated with one another?	.75[1]	.61[1]	.14
How well was the material in one department coordinated with that in others?	.46[1]	.42[1]	.04
What was the relative emphasis upon subject matter and teaching methods?	-.39[2]	-.27	-.12
Did the program build upon fellows' backgrounds?	.80[1]	.24	.56[3]

[1] Correlation differs from zero at the .01 level of significance.
[2] Correlation differs from zero at the .05 level of significance.
[3] Difference between correlations greater than would be expected by chance one time in 100.

D. Evaluation of Courses, Program Administration, and the Location of the Program

As may be seen in Table 9-6, the two sets of institutions differed significantly in the evaluations fellows gave to their best and their worst courses. Fellows in education-based programs rated their courses more favorably than did those in noneducation programs. A difference in the same direction characterized the ratings given the courses intermediate between the best and the worst, though the difference did not attain statistical significance. It should be noted that even in noneducation programs, the average rating of the best course was very close to the judgment "among the top 10% of all the courses I have taken but not the very best." For both sets of institutions, the worst course was rated, on the average, between "the bottom 10% of all the courses I have ever taken" and "below average but not in the bottom 10%." Finally, in both types of program the courses of intermediate quality were said to be somewhat closer to the best course than to the worst one.

Table 9-6. Comparison of Fellows' Ratings of Courses in Education-Based and Noneducation Based Institutions

Item	Location		Difference	Possible range of scores
	Education	Noneducation		
How good was your best course?	5.09	4.90	.19[2]	2-6
How bad was your worst course?	2.57	2.30	.27[1]	1-5
How were the other courses distributed?	3.54	3.38	.16	1-5

[1] Difference greater than would be expected by chance one time in 100.
[2] Difference greater than would be expected by chance one time in 20.

In both education-based and noneducation-based programs, there were significant positive relationships between ratings of effectiveness and judgments of the quality of the best course, the worst course, and the distribution of the remaining courses (Table 9-7).

Table 9-7. Correlations between Ratings of Courses and Effectiveness, Computed Separately for Education-Based and Noneducation-Based Institutions

Item	Location		Difference
	Education	Noneducation	
How good was your best course?	.60[1]	.66[1]	-.06
How bad was your worst course?	.64[1]	.39[2]	.25
How were the other courses distributed?	.69[1]	.68[1]	.01

[1] Correlation differs from zero at the .01 level of significance.
[2] Correlation differs from zero at the .05 level of significance.

Table 9-8 presents comparisons of the two types of programs according to the ratings fellows made of the extent and disposition of problems. It will be seen that education-based programs received more favorable ratings on each of the eight measures; fellows in such programs were less likely than those in noneducation programs to report that the problems interfered seriously with the program's functioning; they were more likely to report that the faculty and director were aware of the problems and tried to solve them, that the director would not show greater allegiance to the faculty than to the fellows on the hypothetical problem, and that the director would probably succeed in remedying such a problem if he tried to do so. Again, it should be noted that, for all items, the mean judgments of fellows in noneducation programs were on the favorable side of neutral.

Table 9-8. Comparison of Fellows' Judgments of Program Problems in Education-Based and Noneducation-Based Institutions

Item	Location		Difference	Possible range of scores
	Education	Noneducation		
How seriously did the problems interfere with the worth of the program?	2.72	3.12	-.40[1]	1-5
How hard did the faculty, exclusive of the director, try to resolve the problems?	3.51	3.06	.45[1]	1-5
To what extent was the director aware of these problems?	4.20	3.91	.29[1]	1-5
How hard did the director try to resolve the problems?	3.88	3.47	.41[1]	1-5
Would the director have become aware of the hypothetical problem over a bad course?	3.40	3.06	.36[1]	1-4
Where would his allegiance have been?	3.08	3.32	-.24[2]	1-5
How much effort would he have made to try to resolve such a problem?	3.25	2.90	.35[1]	1-4
If he had made an effort to resolve that problem, would he have been successful?	2.91	2.72	.19[2]	1-4

[1] Difference greater than would be expected by chance one time in 100.
[2] Difference greater than would be expected by chance one time in 20.

The pattern of correlations between the extent and disposition of problems, on the one hand, and ratings of program effectiveness, on the other, was remarkably similar for the two types of programs. For noneducation-based programs, the correlations did not quite attain statistical significance on three items--the director's awareness of real and of the hypothetical problem, and the director's allegiance on the hypothetical problem; other correlations were significantly different from zero in both sets of institutions. On none of the eight items did the correlations in the two types of institution differ significantly; however, for all eight items the correlations in education-based programs were larger than those in noneducation programs.

Table 9-9. Correlations between Judgments of Program Problems and Effectiveness, Computed Separately for Education-Based and Noneducation-Based Institutions

Item	Location		Difference
	Education	Noneducation	
How seriously did the problems interfere with the worth of the program?	-.72[1]	-.63[1]	-.09
How hard did the faculty, exclusive of the director, try to resolve the problems?	.75[1]	.53[1]	.22
To what extent was the director aware of these problems?	.62[1]	.27	.35
How hard did the director try to resolve the problems?	.77[1]	.53[1]	.24
Would the director have become aware of the hypothetical problem over a bad course?	.48[1]	.30	.18
Where would his allegiance have been?	-.59[1]	-.31	-.28
How much effort would he have made to try to resolve such a problem?	.68[1]	.52[1]	.16
If he had made an effort to resolve that problem, would he have been successful	.51[1]	.41[2]	.10

[1] Correlation differs from zero at .01 level of significance.
[2] Correlation differs from zero at .05 level of significance.

E. Relationships between Fellows and Staff and the Location of the Program

Reports from education-based programs have been compared with those from noneducation programs on 24 distinct items. In 23 of these 24 comparisons, education-based programs received significantly more favorable ratings than their noneducation counterparts; the remaining difference was in the same direction, though it was not large enough to attain statistical significance. A break in this pattern is revealed in

Table 9-10, which presents the education-noneducation comparisons for judgments of the relationship between fellows and staff members. For five of these eight items--the accessibility and helpfulness of the faculty and the director, and the director's interest in the fellows--responses by fellows in noneducation programs did not differ significantly from those of their education-based counterparts. On the remaining three items, significant differences did obtain. Fellows in education-based programs, compared to those in noneducation programs, reported that the faculty exclusive of the director were more interested in ExTFP fellows, that the relationship between fellows and staff was less clearly structured as a teacher-student relationship, and that this relationship was relatively close to what they had expected it to be before they entered the program. Again, for both types of program the average judgment on every item fell on the favorable side of neutral.

Table 9-10. Comparison of Fellows' Perceptions of Their Relationships to the Faculty in Education-Based and Noneducation-Based Institutions

Item	Location		Difference	Possible range of scores
	Education	Noneducation		
How accessible was the faculty, exclusive of the director?	3.20	3.16	.04	1-4
How accessible was the director, himself?	3.30	3.20	.10	1-4
How interested in the fellows was the faculty, exclusive of the director?	4.30	4.06	.24[1]	1-5
How interested in the fellows was the director, himself?	4.51	4.34	.17	1-5
How helpful was the faculty, exclusive of the director?	3.21	3.22	-.01	1-4
How helpful was the director, himself?	3.38	3.34	.04	1-4
Was the relationship that of teacher-student or colleague-colleague?	2.82	3.04	-.22[1]	1-4
How did this compare with what you had hoped would be the relationship?	3.12	3.36	-.24[1]	1-5

[1] Difference greater than would be expected by chance one time in 100.

Except for one item, correlations between ratings of fellow-faculty relations and judged effectiveness were about the same within the two groups. In the education-based institutions there was a strong relationship between effectiveness and whether fellows' expectations were met that their relationship to the staff would be closer than teacher-student; this correlation did not differ significantly from zero in the noneducation-based institutions. This difference in correlation doubtless reflected the fact that experienced teachers are much more nearly colleagues in fact of education-based faculty members than of faculty members in noneducation disciplines. It should also be noted that seven of the eight correlations were more extreme in education-based than in noneducation programs.

Table 9-11. Correlations between Effectiveness and Fellows' Perceptions of Their Relationships to the Faculty, Computed Separately for Education-Based and Noneducation-Based Institutions

Item	Location		Difference
	Education	Noneducation	
How accessible was the faculty, exclusive of the director?	.34[2]	.21	.13
How accessible was the director, himself?	.65[1]	.37[2]	.28
How interested in the fellows was the faculty, exclusive of the director?	.73[1]	.44[1]	.29
How interested in the fellows was the director, himself?	.75[1]	.48[1]	.27
How helpful was the faculty, exclusive of the director?	.58[1]	.63[1]	-.05
How helpful was the director, himself?	.73[1]	.52[1]	.21
Was the relationship that of teacher-student or colleague-colleague?	-.51[1]	-.36[2]	-.15
How did this compare with what you had hoped would be the relationship?	-.74[1]	-.13	-.61[3]

[1] Correlation differs from zero at .01 level of significance.

[2] Correlation differs from zero at .05 level of significance.

[3] Difference between correlations greater than would be expected by chance one time in 100.

F. Operating Strategy and the Location of the Program

Table 9-12 presents the comparisons between education-based and noneducation-based programs on the seven items we have grouped under the heading of "Operating strategy." For six of these items--involving ratings of the program's innovativeness, its level of competition, and the proportion of fellows who would receive advanced degrees--ratings in the two sets of programs did not differ significantly, being on the favorable side of neutral in every case. However, fellows in education-based programs reported that their work load was somewhat less burdensome than did those in noneducation programs.

Table 9-12. Comparison of Fellows' Judgments of Operating Strategy in Education-Based and Noneducation-Based Institutions

Item	Location		Differ-ence	Possible range of scores
	Educa-tion	Non-educa-tion		
How much competition was there for grades, prestige, and recognition?	3.38	3.52	.14	1-5
How did the level of competition affect the fellows' performance?	3.37	3.24	.13	1-5
How did the level of competition affect your own performance?	3.00	2.94	.06	1-5
What proportion of those in your program are likely to receive an advanced degree?	4.26	4.10	.16	1-5
What are your own chances of receiving an advanced degree?	4.75	4.50	.25	1-6
How innovative was your program?	2.92	2.70	.22	1-4
How heavy was the schedule and work load?	2.65	2.82	-.17[1]	1-4

[1] Difference greater than would be expected by chance one time in 20.

Table 9-13 reveals that the pattern of correlations between effectiveness and the extent and effects of competition was markedly different for the two types of program. In education-based programs, it will be noted, ratings of the level of competition were inversely related to ratings of effectiveness, while judgments that the competition had favorable effects upon the group and upon one's own performance were positively related to effectiveness; in noneducation programs none of these correlations differed significantly from zero. No such differences between the patterns of correlations were found with the other four items. In both groups ratings of innovativeness were positively correlated with effectiveness. In neither group did the level of the work load or the chances of receiving an advanced degree correlate to an appreciable extent with judgments of effectiveness.

Table 9-13. Correlations between Effectiveness and Fellows' Judgments of Operating Strategy, Computed Separately for Education-Based and Noneducation-Based Institutions

Item	Location		Difference
	Education	Noneducation	
How much competition was there for grades, prestige, and recognition?	-.45[1]	.15	-.60[4]
How did the level of competition affect the fellows' performance?	.64[1]	-.02	.66[3]
How did the level of competition affect your own performance?	.53[1]	.05	.48[4]
What proportion of those in your program are likely to receive an advanced degree?	.13	.24	-.11
What are your own chances of receiving an advanced degree?	.15	.34[2]	-.19
How innovative was your program?	.62[1]	.34[2]	.28
How heavy was the schedule and work load?	.02	-.17	.19

[1] Correlation differs from zero at .01 level of significance.
[2] Correlation differs from zero at .05 level of significance.
[3] Difference between correlations greater than would be expected by chance one time in 100.
[4] Difference between correlations greater than would be expected by chance one time in 20.

G. Summary

Judgments by fellows in education-based ExTFP institutions were consistently more favorable than those by fellows in noneducation programs on more than two dozen dimensions. In particular, education-based programs received higher ratings of effectiveness and of group morale and solidarity; their fellows reported greater coordination of the parts of the program, more effective interdepartmental cooperation, a better balance between subject matter and teaching methods in the content of the program, and greater relevance of their own background to the procedures of the program. Education-based fellows rated their best and their worst courses more favorably than did fellows in noneducation programs; they also reported both that the problems of their programs were less severe and that the faculty and staff made greater efforts to resolve those problems. Education-based fellows were less likely than those in noneducation programs to label their relations to the program's faculty as "definitely teacher-student" and more likely to say that their relationship with staff members was similar to what they had expected; they also gave more positive reports of the faculty's interest in fellows. Finally, fellows in education-based programs were somewhat less likely than those in noneducation programs to report that their work load was altogether excessive.

On other items, fellows from the two types of programs did not differ substantially. Thus, reports from the two groups showed about the same degree of favorableness in their judgments of the accessibility and helpfulness of the faculty and director of their programs. Similarly, the two groups did not differ in their reports of the level of competition in the program, in their perception of the effects of this competition upon the fellows, in their ratings of the degree of innovativeness of the program, nor in their estimates of the probability that they and other fellows would receive an advanced degree.

These results suggest that the education-based programs were more continuous with the fellows' previous experience, more concerned with their problems as teachers and, consequently, more likely to operate as a group of professionals who differed rather little in status and expertise. By contrast, the noneducation-based programs as a group seem to have followed more closely the classical model of graduate education in which the professor-scholar imparts his knowledge and skills to the student novice.

The half-dozen items which were correlated with effectiveness among education-based programs but not among noneducation programs lend credence to the preceding interpretation. Thus, the two measures of group solidarity were highly correlated with effectiveness, and judgments of the level and effects of competition were negatively correlated with effectiveness, in education-based programs. Presumably, the disorganizing effects of competition and the lack of solidarity made it difficult for fellows in the education-based programs to function as a productive group of cooperating professionals, and thus reduced their effectiveness. In the more formal atmosphere of the noneducation-based programs, it seems likely that group solidarity is essentially irrelevant to learning and to program effectiveness; similarly, in the more traditional academic atmosphere, intense competition probably enhanced, as often as it hindered, the effectiveness of the program. In the same vein, continuity between the fellows' background and their training as well as a relatively equalitarian relationship between fellows and faculty are much less important in the formal academic setting that we have assumed was represented in the noneducation-based programs.

For the most part, however, the correlates of effectiveness were quite similar in the two types of programs. In education-based and noneducation-based programs alike, judgments of program effectiveness varied with (1) fellows' morale and their estimates of group morale; (2) judgments as to the coordination of components of the program; (3) the perceived quality of courses; (4) reports that problems in the program were relatively minor and that the director and other faculty members were interested in resolving whatever problems arose and competent to do so; (5) the perception that relations with the faculty and director were not strictly structured as teacher-student relations, and that the faculty and director were accessible to the fellows, interested in them, and helpful to them, and (6) reports that the program was relatively innovative. In five of these six categories--the exception being the relations between fellows and staff--education-based programs received more favorable ratings from their fellows than did noneducation-based programs. It is particularly important to note that the the same pattern of correlations among responses obtained within the two types of programs in spite of the overall differences in favorableness of response. In neither education-based nor noneducation-based programs did strong relationships hold between ratings of effectiveness and judgments of fellows' work load or perception of the likelihood of obtaining an advanced degree. Some of the implications of the results presented in this chapter will be discussed further in Chapter 13.

IV. Some Implications

Ordinarily, we would end this report with the last chapter. However, it seems to us that these results have implications beyond the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, that they speak to the general problems of graduate and undergraduate education. For this reason, we have appended in this final section a set of short essays which set out our views about these implications.

We have not attempted to exhaust the implications of every finding nor even to address ourselves to many of the most pressing problems of higher education. Instead, we discuss half a dozen or so issues to which our results have some relevance. In Chapter 10, for instance, we discuss the implications for education as a whole of the fact that so many experienced teachers plan to leave the elementary or secondary school classrooms. Fellows' aspirations were only one among a number of attitudes and beliefs which were never communicated to the faculty. In Chapter 11, we discuss at some length the effects upon educational programs of failures to communicate values, intentions, and beliefs. Chapter 12 deals with one of the principal sources of problems in the ExTFP and other educational programs: the fact that many courses are very poorly taught. This is followed, in Chapter 13, by a rather extended discussion of the fact that education-based programs were evaluated more favorably than noneducation-based programs, an outcome from which one may draw extensive and contradictory implications for the role of liberal arts disciplines in teacher education. Finally, in Chapter 14 we speak about the implications of our observations for the administration of higher education.

In these last five chapters, we shall often stray rather far from the data that has been presented in Parts II and III of the report. Often we shall illustrate our points with examples from the intensive studies that have been conducted of individual programs. From time to time we shall evaluate the results of this study in terms of our own beliefs about the proper aims, techniques, and mode of organization of higher education. The purpose of this section, in other words, is not merely to report on a study of one federally financed educational program, but to consider a variety of pressing problems in higher education in terms of the data we have reported above.

Chapter 10

Fellows' Aspirations and Administrators' Expectations

From the results it is clear that many fellows plan to leave the elementary or secondary school classroom at a time not too distant from the present. Fewer than half of the respondents said they hoped to be in the public schools five to ten years from now. Even more striking: when we exclude from consideration all of those fellows who were training for some specialty in which they will operate outside the classroom (for example, fellows in institutes devoted to such topics as guidance, remedial instruction, or the school library) fewer than a third of the ExTFP fellows expected in five to ten years to be involved in teaching at the elementary or secondary level. It was clear that the magnitude of the potential movement of fellows out of elementary and secondary school teaching was not recognized by the faculty and directors: 60% of these staff members said that the most likely occupation for fellows in their program in five to ten years was classroom teaching at the elementary or secondary level; this figure increased to 81% when predictions from institutes for edcuational specialists were excluded.

Staff members in the ExTFP were not simply unaware of the fellows' aspirations, they spoke with embarrassment (mixed with pride) about those fellows in their programs who, they already knew, were going to move into higher education. Like almost everyone else, the typical program director and faculty member conceived of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program as an attempt to improve the quality of teaching of elementary and secondary school teachers. From that point of view, when a particularly well trained teacher moves out of the public schools into a junior college or four-year college, whatever the individual may gain in intellectual stimulation, personal satisfaction, or social status is more than offset by the loss to the public school he leaves.

There can be little doubt that this school-oriented perspective guided the design of the ExTFP from the beginning. Fellows were expected to return to the schools from which they applied, for at least one academic year; in fact, many programs required fellows to pledge to do so. Most likely, it was envisioned that most of the fellows who left those schools would move to positions in larger, better paying communities, but would not be lost to the public schools for good. It is important, then, to consider the factors that seem to account for this unexpected pattern of aspirations and to examine the effects we may expect the realization of these aspirations to have upon the quality of instruction in the public schools.

Once the results are known, they are not at all surprising. From the beginning of American public education, teaching has been a temporary job for many people;

there has been a continuous flow of teachers out of elementary and secondary schools: women have left to become housewives, men to become school administrators or to take positions in some other field than education. In the absence of changes in the material and other rewards of teaching, this pattern remains essentially unchanged. What has changed, however, is the range of academic positions outside the public school which are available to teachers. With the remarkable expansion of colleges and junior colleges in recent years, there has developed a new path out of the public school classroom. Upon the accomplishment of a year's graduate credit and an M.A. degree, an effective high school teacher can move rather easily into junior college teaching, often within the same school system. Not too much additional training beyond the M.A. is required to begin teaching in a college or university, whether in a department of education or in a subject matter discipline. Our interviews revealed very clearly that many fellows were moving along this path even before they applied to the ExTFP; the fellowship simply helped such people achieve their objective somewhat sooner. It is only realistic to expect that this flow of highly qualified teachers out of elementary and secondary schools into junior colleges and colleges will continue for the foreseeable future.

One's first reaction to this trend is likely to be regret. It would be pleasanter and more convenient if teachers who are especially well qualified and capable were to serve out their careers in the public schools. Nevertheless, one can find advantages in this new pattern. Fellows do not typically aspire to new positions for lack of concern with elementary and secondary education, nor with the intention of breaking continuity with their earlier experience. We can expect that many of those who move out of the public school classrooms into higher education, or curriculum development, or school administration will have greater effects upon elementary and secondary education in their new positions than if they had stayed in the classroom. Some such conception seems even to have motivated the drafting of the Higher Education Act of 1965 which said in part:

> ...The term "career in elementary and secondary education" means a career of teaching in elementary and secondary schools, a career of teaching, guiding, or supervising such teachers or persons who plan to become such teachers, or a career in fields which are directly related to teaching in elementary or secondary schools, such as library science, school social work, guidance and counseling, educational media, and special education for handicapped children. (Emphasis added)

It seems only sensible to retain this broad vision when plans are made for future teacher training programs, for the career patterns open to teachers now and in the future present a wider variety of choices than has ever been available heretofore. It will always be important to support and encourage the bright and imaginative teachers who find that they want to remain in the public schools. But we must also recognize that other career patterns exist besides the one which locks a teacher into the classroom for life, patterns which lead the college graduate into the elementary or secondary classroom and then take him out of that classroom into college teaching, or curriculum planning, or administration, or some other position in the educational system. Indeed, it may be that effective recruitment to the teaching profession will require that the lines of advancement be open. For many young people teaching might be a very desirable short-term occupation to precede marriage or a different career, but be quite undesirable if the prospect involves an endless stretch of teaching the same subject without much chance for advancement or for the variety offered by new kinds of positions. Teacher training programs must be developed which recognize these new options and which produce individuals who are broadly enough trained to move along whichever patterns match their own abilities and desires. It seems inevitable that much of the specific training that is required to follow one or another career pattern in education will take place primarily at the graduate level--undergraduate curricula are too crowded and undergraduate students too inexperienced in the art of teaching and the organizational structure of education for things to be otherwise. Thus we can look forward to graduate programs which help teachers not only to keep up with advances in their discipline and in teaching techniques, but which even assist them to move from one educational role to another, while retaining an interest in the processes and problems of public school teaching and while exerting a continuing influence upon educational policy and practices. It appears that the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program has much to say to those who will design these future teacher training programs.

Chapter 11

The Problem of Communication: Misconceptions about Values, Intentions, and Beliefs

The misconceptions people form of one another provide a fascinating topic for study. It is well known that such misconceptions often generate actions that produce discord where there might have been harmony. To misconstrue the intention behind another person's action, to be wrong about the values upon which his acts are based, to misunderstand his interpretation of a situation or his reaction to one's own behavior is to root one's consequent acts in error and to make some sort of inappropriate action more likely than it would otherwise have been. Illustrations of such misconceptions are not hard to find in any social setting, and they were not uncommon in the institutions in which the ExTFP functioned. We have already seen evidence of misunderstandings of this sort in the fact that faculty members were wrong in their estimates of fellows' aspirations, fellows' educational values, and the goals which fellows thought the ExTFP should serve. Misconceptions also occurred about beliefs that were more directly relevant to the program itself, as witness the following three examples.

> One of us sat, one afternoon, in the office of the director of a program, chatting with him and a representative of the fellows at that institution. The director remarked that the fellows had earlier complained that their work load was unrealistically heavy. He had showed them, he explained, that the load was a realistic and reasonable one, that they were under no greater pressure than graduate students not in the ExTFP, that they should have little trouble gradually adjusting to the amount of work they would be given. He believed they had accepted his explanation, and that this complaint was no longer a source of discontent in the group. The director glanced at the fellows' representative for confirmation and received an ambiguous gesture in return, interpretable as assent. Shortly afterward the director was called out of the room. The previously silent fellow then said, "You know, I have to disagree with the director about our work load. All of us are working every available minute when we aren't in class, including nights and week ends. The assignments are so heavy we can't keep up with them. But more than that, there's no question that our load is heavier by at least one full course than what the rest of the graduate students here have to do. It's the cause of real tension and unhappiness. We can't enjoy our work because there is just too much to do."
>
> A team of evaluators in the 1966-67 study talked, over lunch, to the director and staff at an institution. They were told that the fellows were progressing exceptionally well, that there appeared to be no serious difficulties in the program, and that the fellows would almost certainly

return to their schools prepared to do a more effective job of teaching than they had done before. There was no question about the sincerity of these remarks. The staff obviously liked the fellows; they gave examples to justify their statements; clearly, from their point of view the program was a booming success. The evaluators proceeded from lunch to a meeting with the fellows as a group, with no faculty members present. Here they learned that the fellows were profoundly ambivalent toward the program; indeed, some were unrelievedly antagonistic. Their courses had often been interesting and informative, they said, but their program as a whole was disorganized; they were not receiving the kind of training they had expected nor the kind that had been promised in the institution's brochure; they did not see how they could use the material they had been studying in the classes they would be teaching next year; none of their experiences had helped them to understand the educational problems of the schools they had left and to which they would be returning.

To another evaluation team the fellows at an institution spent a substantial part of their group meeting complaining of an instructor with whom they were completing the second installment of a two-semester course. The instructor was sarcastic, they reported; he cut down any suggestions that were made by the fellows, he offered little material on his own account that was of value to them; eventually they had resigned themselves to engaging each week in a desultory two-hour conversation punctuated with long periods of tense silence. But they were angry with the professor that he had done so poorly and with the institution that there was no way of remedying a thoroughly unpleasant situation. In a separate interview the instructor expressed his own perplexity at the direction the course had taken. He had hoped to conduct a class in which ideas were freely advanced, challenged, defended, and examined in detail. He had intended for the discussions to go in whatever directions the fellows' interests led them; for the readings they carried out to be extensions of the discussions generated in class. But, he said, the fellows had not raised questions, challenged assertions, or proposed ideas, and he had been forced eventually to impose his own direction on the seminar. In spite of his colleagues' contrary reports, he was inclined to think the fellows were not especially competent.

As these examples suggest, the disparity that occurred between the view of a program from the fellows' perspective and that from the position of a staff member was sometimes striking. Nor are these examples special cases; they could be expanded ten or twenty fold. The purpose of this chapter, however, is not to multiply instances of miscommunication, but to consider how misconceptions such as these came about and what consequences they may have had for the operation of the programs concerned.

Before we proceed to these considerations, let us question the necessity for communication to occur in the first place. We live in a time when it is fashionable to value communication as an end in itself, to decry any lack of communication between individuals or groups. At just such a time it is important to question the necessity for educational administrators to be constantly tuned to the ideas and concerns of the students in their programs. Might not such an orientation produce an excess of concern with fellows' attitudes instead of their education? Could it not institute a sort of emotional hothouse in which educational objectives were subordinated to interpersonal relations? Perhaps so: it is probably unnecessary, even unwise for a program director to try to learn about every feeling and every complaint of every fellow. Doubtless it is only important for him to be receptive to problems and concerns that are common to a substantial proportion of the fellows, and then only when a knowledge of those concerns might make a difference in the program's effectiveness. But surely it is important that he be aware of dissatisfaction or misunderstandings that might diminish the program's effectiveness, that he be receptive to constructive suggestions that might help the program become more effective.

Let it be clear that the ExTFP programs were not shot through with dissatisfaction, miscommunication, and misunderstanding. We have already examined at length impressive evidence that faculty and fellows liked and respected each other, that the fellows were, in the great majority, very satisfied with their experience. In this congenial context, some things were almost always communicated to the administrator of an ExTFP program. The performance of the fellows, for example, was an item of information each director had at his fingertips. He could tell questioners which fellows seemed to be doing well and which relatively poorly and why, and how the fellows as a group stacked up against other students at the institution, usually citing gradepoint averages as hard evidence for the points he was making. Other things were communicated besides grades, of course. Information about the regional background and family problems of individual fellows, anecdotes that illustrated an individual's intellectual tastes or his personal style, or stories about memorable exchanges in a classroom were likely to receive fairly wide circulation among the faculty in the program as well as among the fellows. The high correlations, reported above, between fellows' and faculty members' reports of morale and solidarity suggests that fellows' general reactions to each other and to the program were commonly known by most of those associated with that program, including the faculty and administrators. Furthermore, as we have seen, really serious problems almost always reached the ear of the program director and other faculty members. There might have been an extended delay between the event that initiated a problem and its communication to the director, or the initial approach to the director may have been an oblique one, made with less intensity than the underlying emotion would have indicated; nevertheless, when a source of severe dissatisfaction existed in a program, the responsible administrators almost never remained totally ignorant of the problem.

What, then, was not communicated? For one thing, fellows' aspirations and their attitudes concerning the proper goals and procedures of education. Apparently there existed widespread misconceptions on both sides of the desk about the beliefs of the person in the other role. Why did these misunderstandings exist? Perhaps because there was seldom a context in which the relevant information could be exchanged. Neither in class nor in informal gatherings did the fellows and their professors commonly exchange ideas about whether the proper function of schoolteachers is to transmit facts or to encourage an enquiring attitude; only rarely was there a setting where fellows could talk to their instructors about their long-range aspirations. Furthermore, misunderstandings of this sort very seldom reduced the effectiveness of the program in the eyes of the fellows or the staff sufficiently that they became major sources of tension in the program. Thus, information that would have corrected the misconceptions was seldom exchanged.

Should such information have been exchanged? Well, a whole series of decisions about the content of courses, the material they emphasized, and the sequence in which they were taken were influenced by assumptions about the aspirations of the fellows and their attitudes concerning the goals and functions of teachers. Different assumptions might have led to a different mode of organization. When the assumptions were wrong, the educational experience might easily have been less relevant to the needs of the typical student or of less use in his later career than if his actual aspirations and attitudes had been known. Information about the nature of fellows' goals and values is not hard to obtain; it might have been used to change for the better the content or practices of many ongoing programs.

There were other instances in which a lack of communication about problems in the program or a misunderstanding of the goals and intentions of others led to more serious consequences than those we have just discussed. The examples at the beginning of this chapter describe three such cases. To demonstrate that the fellows, as well as the faculty and administrators, could be party to such misunderstandings let us consider what occurred more than once in institutions whose academic requirements were ambiguous.

However well intentioned the faculty and administration of a program may be, when that program is new its purposes and objectives are often unclear, its requirements frequently remain ambiguous and subject to change. Since the ExTFP was no more than two years old in any institution, such ambiguities often occurred within its structure. From the institutional perspective, an ambiguous set of requirements has its advantages; it permits a degree of flexibility to the program that would be absent were detailed requirements and procedures decided upon prematurely. For the fellows, however, there were few obvious advantages to such ambiguity, and its disadvantages were impressive. Most fellows carried a very heavy load of work; in most institutions their fellowship terminated after one year; unclarities in the program's requirements, and the possibility of changes in those requirements, often made it questionable whether they could complete the program within their time limitation. Not only was each fellow under considerable tension from the pressure of a heavy work load, a deadline for completion, and an ambiguous set of requirements, but the en bloc nature of the program made it clear that all of the fellows were subject to the same tension.

These circumstances produced in some institutions the classic conditions for the generation and transmission of rumors. There sometimes developed a pervasive suspicion and mistrust of the intentions of the faculty or the administration. Trivial remarks by a staff member might be construed in a manner much different from his intention, yielding an interpretation which justified and increased the existing mistrust. In one institution, for example, a substantial proportion of the fellows became convinced that the program was falsely advertised, that a proud and arrogant faculty had no intention of awarding an advanced degree to more than a handful of fellows. This conception and the coordinate resentment persisted for six months or more, always apparently reconfirmed in the actions or conversation of one staff member or another, until it was finally dispelled by the clear evidence that virtually everyone would receive the degree. The interpretation and the intensity with which it was held were never communicated to the faculty or the director of the program.

When people in one role refrain from telling those in the other role about their problems, doubts, and dissatisfactions, the likelihood that any actions will be taken to change the situation or to make it more acceptable is obviously much reduced. More than that, the tension and resentment that attends the dissatisfactions will persist and may become more intense, diminishing the productivity of the student, distracting him from his principal objectives, and making unpleasant an experience that might have been exhilarating.

Why, then, did people not complain about their dissatisfactions? For one thing, there exist strong pressures which prevent individuals from running to the administration with criticisms that are less than intense. In part these pressures rest upon the common belief that a person should try to resolve his own problems before he calls on others for help. In addition, there is a general hesitancy to be the bearer of bad tidings; people often prefer not to speak if all they have to say is negative. And this reluctance to criticize is colored by a second factor that interferes with easy communication between student and staff: fear of reprisal.

Whether we like it or not, the relation between a student and a faculty member or an administrator is a power relationship in which the student is at a considerable disadvantage. One is reluctant to complain to someone if one is afraid of being punished for complaining; in more than one institution fellows told evaluation teams that they believed reprisals might follow upon honest criticism and complaint, often fellows cited actions which they believed exemplified such reprisals. Why might a student fear reprisals for expressing his dissatisfaction? Because, as everyone knows, it is only human to become defensive and resentful when one's performance or one's plans are criticized and challenged. Faculty members and administrators are no less human than anyone else. Without being intentionally vindictive, they might express their resentment in a variety of hostile actions, ranging from coolness or anger to the use of excessively stringent grading standards or the introduction of more extreme requirements. Some of these actions may be unintentioned, growing out of vague feelings of anger and resentment. So long as this is true, before a student will present sensitive and potentially disturbing criticisms to a faculty member or administrator he must either be convinced that no reprisals will be taken or be moved by an unusually intense feeling of dissatisfaction and distress. And when he does attempt to talk about his dissatisfactions, the chances are that his approach will be an indirect one, the more so the more sensitive the issue.

For all these reasons, an administrator who tells ExTFP fellows to come to him when they have a problem and leaves it at that can be relatively sure he will not learn about problems and dissatisfactions until they are intensely felt. Less than extreme problems, but disquieting ones, may pass from common concern as they work themselves out over time, they may continue as low-level sources of irritation for the balance of the program, or they may escalate in importance to the point where they are serious enough to justify a direct approach to the administrator. Only in the latter case does the administrator learn about them. To detect such problems when they are less intense and more manageable, he has to establish an atmosphere in which free, relatively uninhibited comments about the program are encouraged and are not punished. It must be emphasized that the responsibility for establishing such an atmosphere rests primarily with those who possess the greater power, the administration and the faculty.

Much of what we have been saying can be summed up in a cliche: It is important to keep open the lines of communication between the various parties to an institutional program. The only problem with the cliche is that it identifies the goal but not how to get there. One does not get there, for instance, either by issuing a pronouncement that the lines of communication are henceforth open or by pressing intently to determine what the fellows are really thinking. It is likely that one requirement for easy communication is the establishment of a situation in which the faculty and director are frequently in contact with fellows on a relatively informal basis. Given such contact, there are at least three further requirements: alertness to nuances of meaning, the absence of defensiveness, and some sort of assurance that retaliation will not follow. As to the first, it is necessary to recognize that an apparently mundane question or comment may be an indirect attempt to raise a problem for discussion. One has to respond to such comments in a way that permits a problem to surface if there is one, yet permits the conversation to proceed if there is no problem or if the student is not yet prepared to discuss it. And when a problem or a complaint is finally raised, it is essential that it be granted legitimacy, even if it is based on a misconception. The purpose of the discussion must be not simply to defend the status quo, but to examine alternative interpretations and to arrive at some common conception or some resolution to a problem which is satisfactory to all the parties. Often such a resolution will require action on the part of the administration, but that is a topic to which we will return in a later chapter. For the present let us turn to a common source of dissatisfaction in the ExTFP and elsewhere in academia: the bad course.

Chapter 12

The Bad Course

Since, by all accounts, most courses in the ExTFP were good and many were excellent, it is not altogether distressing to learn that there was one very bad course in half or more of the programs: only one bad course means that eight or nine were not so bad, and that is good. Nevertheless, it is disquieting to learn that nearly a fourth of the fellows said the worst course in their program was the worst they had ever taken, and half said it was in the lowest tenth of all the courses they had taken. To be disturbed about these reports one need not assume that they were literally true, for it is well known that present displeasures are more offensive than past ones. Still, the reports indicate that more than half of the institutions offered at least one very bad course. Surely, the ratio of good to bad undergraduate and graduate courses outside the ExTFP must have been, at best, no higher than the ratio within the Experienced Teacher Program. We must conclude, then, that American higher education as a whole is plagued by an unexpectedly high incidence of consistently bad teaching. There is independent evidence that such is the case. Discussing the quality of undergraduate teaching, the Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Instruction at the University of Toronto had this to say:

> We are disturbed by the evidence that a significant proportion of the lectures offered to undergraduates are simply bad... We were told by an undergraduate witness at one public hearing, and subsequent inquiries have given us no reason to doubt this, that a student thinks himself fortunate if, of the (say five) lecturers he has in any one year, one is first-rate and no more than one is deplorably bad.... The frequency with which the submissions to us have requested either, or both, systematic appraisals of lecturers' teaching ability, and systematic instruction in pedagogical techniques reinforces our view that there is a serious shortcoming for which remedies should be sought.[1]

---

[1] Undergraduate Instruction in Arts and Science. Report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Instruction in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, University of Toronto. University of Toronto Press, 1967, pp. 37-38.

The fact that most of the institutions in the ExTFP offered at least one course that was poorly taught, combined with a variety of other evidence similar to the Toronto report, suggests that the quality of teaching in American colleges and universities deserves widespread attention. It is to the general problem of the bad course that we address ourselves in this section.

To determine whether some factor or set of factors could be found which characterized ExTFP courses that were judged to be inferior, an informal examination was made of the records of the two score or more institutions whose programs were visited by evaluation teams or by the present writers. There appeared to be no simple predictors of inadequate courses. Their content varied from substantive fields, such as history or sociology, to professional courses in methods of teaching or in counselling and guidance. Some were taught by instructors, others by full professors. Some were given bad marks because the material was thought to be trivial or unimportant, others because the instructor was dull and uninteresting, others because the instructor did not make clear the complexities of his subject, others for any of the dozens of additional reasons students use to complain about courses.

Even though there were no clearly discernible predictors of whether a course would be adjudged bad, the consequences of such a course--resentment and dissatisfaction--were nearly universal. We have already seen that ratings of program effectiveness were strongly correlated with fellows' evaluations of their courses. This observation was repeatedly confirmed in the experience of evaluation teams and in the intensive study of three programs, as it has been in the experience of generations of students. The poorly-taught course is a constant source of irritation for its students. Usually students do not learn as much in such a course as they think they should; more than that, a student may be alienated permanently from an important and valuable field of study by an academic course he finds intolerable.

It is interesting to consider how fellows' complaints about such courses were handled in the ExTFP. Sometimes no action at all was taken, and the fellows' could take solace only in the knowledge that the administration had been told how bad the course was. At other times, a different instructor was brought in to take over the course, though this was almost never done while a course was in progress, but only at the semester's end. In only a very few cases was the instructor talked to, or relieved of the course, or helped in teaching it. As might be expected, the extent of the action that was taken while the course was in progress varied inversely with the academic status of the professor.

These actions are not essentially different from present practices in American education as a whole, except that there was probably more intervention in the ExTFP than in the typical educational program. Only in the most extreme cases does someone other than the professor act to change a course in time to affect the learning of the students who are taking that course and complaining about it. More often than not, no action is taken even to ensure that a bad course is modified before it is taught again. Almost never is some systematic action taken to improve the level of performance of the teacher who is doing poorly.

Grant that some action ought to be taken to improve college instruction. Then the question is, what kind of action? The answer one gives to that question varies with what one considers to be the cause of inadequate teaching. The factors that are most commonly blamed for poor teaching can be grouped under three general headings according to whether they refer to the teacher's lack of natural ability to teach, to his lack of motivation to teach, or to his ignorance of how to teach and of what he is doing wrong.

On the assumption that some individuals simply lack the ability to teach, a simple solution to the problem of the bad course is frequently advanced: get rid of the bad teacher. The solution has a certain appeal beyond its simplicity. Doubtless some people are not suited by temperament or ability to teaching; the general level of university instruction would probably be raised somewhat if such individuals were identified and encouraged to leave the classroom before they received tenure. But nobody would suggest that bad courses will disappear when those with little talent for teaching have been eliminated. The truth is that every professor, even the brightest and most talented, remembers at least one class period when he performed abysmally; most teachers with a few years' experience can point to one or more of their courses which was poor thoughout. The problem is not so much how to eliminate the inept as how to help every instructor reduce the variability in his teaching, so that he performs consistently well.

The argument is frequently made that many college professors are primarily motivated to achieve other goals than excellence in teaching. According to this argument, it will be necessary for the system of rewards in higher education to be altered if the level of teaching is to be improved: good teaching as well as good research should be recognized and rewarded; bad teaching, like bad research, should also be identified and corrected. If some such change in the reward structure were actually adopted, many faculty members would probably direct more of their attention to the teaching function and would be less inclined to permit scholarly work or committee assignments to interfere with the preparation and teaching of their courses, and doubtless the quality of their performance would improve. Nevertheless, it seems doubtful that such a change in policy, by itself, would be sufficient to produce the desired ends. Even under the present system of rewards, the great majority of college professors would like to be excellent teachers; only a very few do not care if they do poorly in the classroom. For such individuals to do better, they will have to discover what it is they are presently doing poorly and what alternatives hold promise of increased effectiveness.

The Course Evaluation Questionnaire is commonly advocated as a means of showing an instructor what it is he is doing wrong. By examining the judgments of his students about his course, it is argued, a teacher can learn what aspects need to be changed in order for the course to have greater student acceptance. There can be little doubt that such questionnaires sometimes serve this function. They can identify aspects of a person's lectures, his assignments, his examinations, or his personal mannerisms which, if changed, would improve student response to his course. Nevertheless, we remain unconvinced that the adoption of evaluation questionnaires will really improve faculty performance in those courses that are taught very badly because such questionnaires do not ordinarily show an instructor how he can help a student see the profound insights that lie below the surface of a subject, nor do they help a dull lecturer discover how to conduct an exciting class. Beyond this, in the really unsuccessful course the evaluation questionnaire probably only tells the instructor what he already knew: that he performed poorly. When a person wanted to teach a course well and knows he did not, additional evidence of his failure is not likely either to lift his spirits or to help him understand how to do better next time. The most common reaction to an attack on one's self-esteem is defensiveness.

There are a number of factors that stand in the way of objective, dispassionate discussion of a colleague's deficiencies in teaching. Among these are the implicit assumption that teaching ability is a natural aptitude little influenced by training, and the consequent intense embarrassment that one feels about talking to another person either about that person's poor teaching or about one's own. The assumption is invalid on its face: teaching ability can certainly improve with training; it is necessary, then, to consider how the embarrassment may be overcome. The Toronto report suggests that the university make video-tape equipment and technicians available to faculty upon request for filming of their classes. This would permit a professor to view his performance as his students see it and to check on his improvement over time; it avoids most of the embarrassment of other procedures because the tape can be erased, and nobody except the professor himself needs to see it. Athletic coaches have used analagous procedures for years; that they help perfect athletic performances, which obviously depend so heavily upon natural ability, argues strongly for their usefulness in developing a more intellectually-based skill such as teaching.

A solitary witnessing of one's performance might be helpful, but it should be more helpful, still, to discuss that performance with others. A relatively unthreatening discussion of this sort might be accomplished in informal faculty seminars where a few faculty members visited each other's classes, discussed each other's performance, and analyzed each other's common problems. Again, such procedures are already in use, this time in undergraduate teacher-training programs (often taught within sight of the offices of professors who are notorious for their bad teaching). What is necessary, of course, is that the procedures be problem-centered; that criticisms be constructive, not personal attacks; that defensiveness be minimized and mutual assistance maximized.

We agree with the authors of the Toronto report that the institution of formal courses in a teacher-training department will not accomplish much improvement in college teaching. Indeed, the kinds of programs we envision, to be effective, would shun the stultifying effects of routine, institutionalized procedures; they ought, instead, to work toward spontaneity and flexibility by building on the faculty member's own motivation, permitting individuals or groups to work out their own procedures with only limited advice and assistance from others who have been through a similar experience. In any case, it seems to us critically important for colleges and universities to try to establish procedures, supportive and non-threatening in nature, to help their faculties improve the quality of instruction.

Chapter 13

One Victory for the Educationists

For many years the traditional academic disciplines in colleges and universities paid little attention to the preparation of elementary and secondary school teachers. The task was considered unintellectual, unscholarly, and, in the university setting, unimportant. Those who engaged in it were often viewed as less competent than their colleagues in the traditional disciplines. This view of teacher preparation and its practitioners may not have been altogether undeserved. On many campuses there has existed an informal consensus among students and faculty that courses concerned with how to teach were among the worst in the university. Small wonder that rarely, if ever, did departments or individuals in the liberal arts disciplines become involved in the preparation of teachers.

To many professors in colleges of education the withdrawal of the traditional disciplines from teacher training was acceptable, if not desirable. It is possible, they have argued, to teach a person too much English, especially when that person will have the responsibility of teaching high school students. If departments of English were directly involved in the preparation of teachers, they reasoned, the danger would arise of overemphasizing subject matter at the expense of methods of teaching. More recently, as curriculum studies have made it clear that mathematics teachers need to know more mathematics, English teachers more English, and history teachers more history, there has developed a change in view toward the position that the disciplines have a critical role to play in teacher preparation; nevertheless, the gap between the academic disciplines and schools of teacher education has remained a wide one.

In the late 1950's, Federal legislation was passed which was designed to involve the academic disciplines in teacher education. By making large amounts of money available, the Office of Education was able to encourage if not a marriage of schools of education to the academic disciplines, at least a rather passionate wooing of one by the other. Later programs, such as the ExTFP, required the signatures of functionaries from Liberal Arts and Education schools on proposals; they required that courses in both teaching methods and subject matter appear on the program, and they forced the presence on the faculty of both teacher-education and subject-matter specialists. One result of these programs was a sudden wave of interest from the academic departments of colleges and universities in conducting federally-financed institutes and workshops for teachers. For a change, many schools of education felt needed, if not loved, by their colleagues in the disciplines. It seemed reasonable to suppose that the resumption by the subject-matter disciplines of the task of training teachers would noticeably improve the quality of teacher-training programs.

Since just under half of the ExTFP programs were administered by education departments and just over half by noneducation departments (usually departments in the traditional academic disciplines), it was possible in the present study to compare the effectiveness of the two types of programs. To our surprise, and contrary to common beliefs, education-based programs received consistently higher ratings from ExTFP fellows than did noneducation programs. A detailed accounting of these results was presented in Chapter 9; it need not be repeated here. It will be enough to say, in summary, (a) that education-based programs differed significantly from noneducation programs on every one of the five judgments of effectiveness and (b) that on the remaining items, describing program characteristics, education-based programs also received consistently more favorable ratings than noneducation programs. Although there were a handful of items on which judgments of the two types of programs did not differ significantly, there was not a single critical comparison which favored programs housed in liberal arts and related departments over those based in schools of education.

One must not infer from these results that all noneducation-based programs were judged to be poor or that all education-based programs were rated as good. These differences between education and noneducation programs took place in a context of generally favorable judgments: the great majority of programs were given high marks for effectiveness whatever the location of the sponsoring department. In addition, there was great variability in the ratings that were given to programs within each of the two broad groups: some noneducation-based programs were judged to be very effective while some education-based programs were rated as quite ineffective. Nevertheless, the outstanding education-based programs received somewhat higher ratings than the best noneducation programs, and poorly-received education-based programs still were given higher marks than the worst of the noneducation programs.

So the results confuted the assumption that teacher training programs in schools of education will inevitably be dull and poorly received. Does this mean that the dismal reputation of such programs is largely unjustified? Not necessarily, even though it is clear both from these results and from direct observation that such programs can be challenging, rewarding, and effective. The problem is that both direct observation and informal consensus on campuses around the country reveal that many courses in teacher education are stultifying, inconsequential, and boring. One can hardly infer from 32 specially-selected instances that the unhappy reputation of a thousand or more such courses is undeserved. If we are not to reject the common judgment, however, we must show how it could be that these 32 programs came off so much better than the 36 specially-selected noneducation-based programs.

One explanation of these results is to deny that they mean what they seem to mean. It can be argued that fellows' judgments of effectiveness do not really reflect the true effectiveness of a course or a bundle of courses, so that education-based programs were not necessarily the more effective ones. One might even propose that real learning requires the modification and reorganization of basic beliefs and behavior, that this reorganization is often unpleasant or even painful; on the assumption that the disturbed student actually profited more than the satisfied one, the results would actually favor the noneducation-based programs rather than disfavor them. But such an interpretation is not at all persuasive, for it founders on the specificity of the items that fellows responded to. Fellows were not asked how pleasurable their experience had been but whether it was stimulating and interesting, how much they had learned, how realistic were the program's objectives, how applicable the material would be to their later work. It is hard to argue that responses to such items would be inversely related to true program effectiveness. Beyond the face validity of such items, there is independent evidence that they are valid measures of effectiveness. Thus, correlations between fellows' judgments of effectiveness and those by faculty members were consistently positive. Even more impressive, in the 1966-67 study the judgments of program effectiveness by independent teams of evaluators correlated highly with fellows' reports, more highly than with those by faculty members and directors. In short, it appears unreasonable to account for these paradoxical results by denying their validity; we will have to look for other factors that may reasonably account for the observations.

It seems to us that a reasonable explanation of the results may be achieved by calling upon four different but related factors: the greater comfort, familiarity, and congeniality that ExTFP fellows must have experienced in education-based programs; the probability that the faculty in such programs were more involved in the ExTFP than were those in noneducation programs; the likelihood that courses in methods of instruction were more innovative in education-based than in noneducation programs; and the possibility that courses in education-based programs had greater relevance than those in noneducation programs to the needs and backgrounds of experienced teachers, yielding more sources of satisfaction for the fellows.

Consider, first, the matter of familiarity and comfort. Most teachers have been prepared in schools of education. Returning to a familiar world where they knew the rules must have provided a more comfortable reentry into graduate work, than did invading the alien world of a "pure" discipline. More than that, the expectations of fellows probably differed as a function of whether they entered programs in an education department or a liberal arts discipline. Doubtless fellows entered education-based programs thinking that they would be able to profit from the experiences of their colleagues (and contribute to the education of those colleagues) almost as much as they would learn from the faculty. When this kind of productive interchange actually took place among fellows and faculty and when, in addition, a substantial amount of subject matter was mastered (and recall that almost nobody reported that subject matter was slighted in favor of methods of instruction) a strong sense of accomplishment was achieved. By contrast, ExTFP fellows recognized their lack of expertise in the specialized disciplines; they expected to contribute relatively little from their own background to the conduct of courses within those disciplines.

In addition to the factor of familiarity, it seems to be true that faculty members in education departments were more deeply involved in the ExTFP than were those in the traditional disciplines. This difference in commitment affected the tone of the programs in the two types of institutions even though both subject-matter and teacher-education specialists were involved in every program. The general atmosphere of an Experienced Teacher Program was usually set by the department in which it was administered. Compared to programs in noneducation departments, the atmosphere of education-based programs was more equalitarian: fellows reported that the faculty and director were more interested in them and more helpful, that fellow-faculty relations were less clearly structured along the traditional teacher-student pattern, that the fellows' backgrounds were more consistently used in the conduct of the program. Such an outcome is hardly surprising, for the Experienced Teacher Program is directly in line with the interests, background, and training of the professor of education; he finds teaching in that program both personally challenging and professionally relevant; he is even willing to grant the fellows some measure of expertness in his own field. By contrast administering or teaching in a one-year program for elementary or secondary teachers is a task that is largely irrelevant to the professional activities of university professors who are not connected with a school of education; they are likely to have only an incidental interest in such an assignment. Furthermore, whatever their interest in the assignment or their views about the qualities of public school teachers, such professors quite properly look upon the experienced teacher as a special variety of graduate student: an apprentice scholar, perhaps, but not yet a colleague or even a junior colleague.

Some of the differences in tone that characterized the two types of programs may be inferred from a study of those seven items for which correlations with effectiveness differed significantly between the two groups. These items involved judgments of group spirit and group involvement, whether the program made use of fellows' background and experience, whether fellows' relationships to the faculty were more formal than had been expected, and the magnitude and effects of competition among the fellows. In every case, responses to these items were more higly correlated with effectiveness in education-based programs than in noneducation programs. The high positive correlations in education-based programs mean that programs were judged to be effective when the fellows' backgrounds were actually of use in their courses, when relationships with the faculty were not especially formal, when cooperation among fellows was not undermined by an intensely competitive academic environment, and when strong feelings of group spirit and solidarity prevailed. In other words, in the most effective education-based programs the fellows and the faculty operated to some degree as a cooperating, solidary group, each member contributing to the effectiveness of the program. In noneducation programs, where fellows were truly inexpert, effectiveness was unrelated to the use of the fellows' background or to the formality of relations between fellows and faculty; in this rather formal atmosphere, competitition among fellows did not necessarily interfere with effectiveness, since it was not necessary for the group to work in close cooperation in order to accomplish the program's goals.

Thus, the satisfactions of fellows in most noneducation programs depended principally upon their accomplishments in the discipline itself. By contrast, fellows in education-based programs could achieve satisfaction from an increased mastery of a subject matter, from an increased understanding of the art of teaching, or from their own involvement in and contribution to the conduct of their courses. For two reasons it is necessary in this connection to emphasize the importance of methods courses: first, because such courses provided the principal vehicle by which the fellows' backgrounds were utilized; second, because of the very real benefits such courses often conveyed.

Professors in the traditional academic disciplines like to believe that elementary and secondary teachers are short on substantive knowledge of the structure of their fields, unaware of the basic principles that guide a historian, a mathematician, or a scientist in his professional work. It is difficult to dispute this proposition, especially in view of the misinformation and misunderstanding that high school graduates regularly bring to introductory college courses. A second proposition, commonly advanced as a corrolary to the first, holds that courses in methods of instruction are of little real value in teacher training and should largely be subordinated to courses in the discipline the student will teach. This second proposition is seriously in error. Perhaps it arises not only from the deplorable reputation of the typical methods course but also from the different situations in which the public school teacher and the college professor work. The instructor in college can reasonably assume that most of the students in his courses are there to learn; he need feel little personal responsibility when an unmotivated student performs poorly. The typical teacher in the lower schools is not in the same fortunate position. Most of his students are required to attend school and, once there, to take a prescribed sequence of courses. A substantial proportion of the students in his classes will not find the material intrinsically interesting or relevant to their lives and experience. To perform effectively in such a situation, a teacher must capture his students' interest, show them the relevance of the material, catch them up in the study of his subject. It is not always obvious how to do these things; the purpose of a methods course is to help a teacher/student learn how.

Obviously, not all methods courses help people learn how to communicate the essence of their subjects, let alone how to interest and stimulate their students. Yet some do. In fact, rather exciting development have taken place in the field of teacher education, ranging from the practice of recording a student teacher's performance on videotape for subsequent viewing and analysis, to the creation of educational games which simulate complex social and historical situations so that the players may discover at first hand the processes that operate within these situations. Follow-up interviews that have recently been conducted with Experienced Teacher fellows who have returned to their schools reveal that many of them are performing with much greater effectiveness and satisfaction than before they entered the program, and as a direct result of discovering how their material might be presented in novel and imaginative ways. Other fellows, of course, were quite dissatisfied with their methods courses they had taken.

It is our impression that imaginative and innovative courses in methods of instruction were more commonly offered in education-based than in noneducation-based programs. With one or two very notable exceptions, courses in methods of teaching played a rather peripheral role in noneducation-based programs; they operated in parallel with courses in the discipline itself, more often than not they were altogether independent of such courses. By contrast, an education-based program which made it through the evaluation and screening process to final funding for the ExTFP was almost certain to have as a central component one or more methods courses which, on paper at least, promised to be imaginative, exciting, and effective.

But why should the presence of imaginative courses in teaching methods affect the satisfaction of those experienced teachers--numerically a majority of the fellows in the ExTFP--who hoped in the long run to leave the public school classroom? As a matter of fact, such courses were relevant to the future work of most of the fellows whatever their aspirations might have been. The usefulness of these courses to the school administrator or the specialist in curriculum development is obvious; even those fellows who hoped to move into two-year or four-year colleges still expected to be teaching; it was the unusual fellow who expected to move completely out of the field of education and teaching. Thus, for the great majority of experienced teachers, an effective methods course was not only interesting in its own right but relevant to their past and future experience as teachers; in addition, a mediocre methods course or a bad one was probably a greater irritant than an ineffectual course in one of the disciplines because the experienced teachers could so easily detect its inadequacies.

We have suggested as plausible explanations for the fact that education-based programs were judged to be more effective than noneducation programs the propositions that fellows felt more comfortable in education-based departments; that the faculty of such programs were more committed to the ExTFP; that education-based programs had more imaginative, innovative courses in methods of instruction; and that more different sources of satisfaction were available to fellows in education-based programs. But what have we learned about whether teacher-training programs ought to be housed in departments of education or in liberal arts departments? We have learned, perhaps, that this is the wrong question. For it is clear that a teacher's education must include solid instruction in both subject matter and techniques of instruction. On the one hand, teachers cannot communicate what they do not know. In one discipline after another over the last ten years or so we have discovered that many teachers never learned the basic principles and techniques of their subject and many others failed to keep up with fundamental changes in their fields. Obviously, to be effective a teacher must be trained in his subject and must then keep abreast of it. On the other hand, there are techniques by which a subject may be taught more effectively than is ordinarily done; there are ways of helping a teacher to discover and correct his weaknesses and to develop and consolidate his strong points. A teacher-training program seriously slights its students if it fails to include in its curriculum effective courses that embody these techniques.

So it appears that both content and methods courses ought to be included in teacher training programs, and that these courses should be taught, without condescension, by faculty members who are involved in and committed to the program, using the student's own background where possible, and bringing him into the course as a participating scholar instead of a passive recipient. These conclusions are hardly new. It appears, however, that in the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program during the years 1966 to 1968 these goals were more nearly accomplished in top-flight education departments than in the traditional disciplines. Perhaps as specialists in the disciplines become more involved with experienced teachers, more concerned with helping them, and less condescending toward them, the differences between the two types of programs will diminish; if so, we will no longer need to ask where teacher-training programs ought to be housed but only what they ought to include.

Chapter 14

On the Administration of Higher Education

> "A partial enumeration of the functions that a program director performs yields a list of impressive length. He should be directly involved in deciding upon the course content and the mode of organization of the program, he must make sure that the formal courses and the supplemental activities are coordinated, must arrange for the presence of whatever educational materials are required, must encourage informal exchanges among fellows and between fellows and staff, must try to mediate in disputes that may develop among participants, must ascertain the fellows' and the faculty's views and criticisms of the program and its effectiveness, must decide whether changes in procedures or content are required, and, when the decision is affirmative, must determine what changes to make in the program and how to make them. In a program whose success relies in good part upon the establishment of high esprit de corps among the participants and upon the group's performance en bloc, the fulfillment of these functions can be critically important. There are doubtless some programs which run smoothly from beginning to end, never requiring the mediating influence of a skillful administrator. In the typical institution, however, at some time during the year crises arise, interests conflict, difficulties occur which require effective administrative action. At such times it is essential that the program director possess the ability, the time, and especially the institutional power to respond effectively to the demands of the situation." Report on the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, 1966-67, pp. 7-8.

The Role of the Director: Some Examples and Generalizations

The results of the 1967-68 study give no reason to change the preceding assessment of the director's role in promoting a stimulating and effective program. When fellows reported that problems were minimal or nonexistent in their programs they also reported that the director and staff were interested in them, helpful to them, and competent to resolve problems if they arose. Judgments on all of these variables correlated very highly with ratings of effectiveness and morale. Although these correlations verify the intimate connection between the director's performance and program effectiveness, they do not make clear the kinds of actions that distinguish directors of effective programs from those of ineffective ones. Some concrete examples may illustrate more clearly how the director's behavior sometimes made a considerable difference in the outcome of a program.

1. What Do We Do with a Poorly-Taught Course?

As we have suggested in Chapter 12, complaints about the quality of courses were probably the most common expressions of dissatisfactions with the ExTFP. When the fellows finally became disturbed enough about the conduct of such a course that they tried to have it changed, they typically took their complaints to the director, who was then responsible for whatever actions were taken to remedy the situation. Three examples, each involving a two-semester course, will illustrate the variety in the responses directors made to such complaints.

> In one institution the fellows quickly formed an intense and probably justified dislike for a course which was taught by a full professor. The course was supplementary to the general orientation of the program, being offered through a school of the university different from the one in which the sponsoring department was located. Fellows felt that the content of the course repeated material they had taken as undergraduates and that the professor smothered or rejected their contributions to the course and their attempts to raise its level. They complained often and vigorously to the program director, a young associate professor. The director was sympathetic to their complaints. However, he was so much impressed with his low status relative to the professor that he was reluctant to approach the professor directly about the fellows' complaints. He also recognized that any actions he might take through official channels to try to change either the instructor or his teaching methods would involve a great deal of painful maneuvering through the university's bureaucracy, bringing him into contact with two sets of deans, one from each of the schools. In the end, he found it impossible to take any action at all, either to apprise the professor of the fellows' opinions, to change the manner in which the course was taught, or to replace the professor with someone else who might teach the course differently. The fellows had to continue in that course for two unhappy semester, to their intense frustration and discontent.
>
> In a second institution, after a month or so of the school year the fellows complained persistently to the director, who was also department chairman, about a course that was offered by the next most influential and prestigeful member of the department. Again, the director listened sympathetically to their complaints without taking any overt action. However, a course evaluation questionnaire was given to the fellows at the end of the term. It revealed to the professor the depth of the fellows' dislike for his course, to his great surprise and discomfiture. The professor and the director, jointly, then decided that the course should be taught by a different member of the faculty during the second semester. The fellows found

the second installment of the course much more satisfactory than the first; they were also impressed and gratified by this evidence that their opinions had instituted a substantial change in the conduct of the program.

In the third university, the offending faculty member was a part-time instructor and the course was supplemental to the central focus of the program, being offered by a different department but in the same school of the university. After hearing increasingly bitter complaints about the quality of the course and the ineptness of the instructor, toward the middle of the semester the program director went directly to the instructor to tell him about the fellows' complaints and to discuss how the course might be improved. The instructor was distressed to learn about the fellows' reactions; nevertheless, he worked out a series of changes in the course and he also held an informal meeting with the fellows to talk about their objections and to defend his procedures and goals. Subsequently, the course seems to have improved somewhat, but it remained below the level of other courses in the program. Convinced of the justice of the fellows' complaints, the director persuaded the other department to assign a different instructor to the course for the second semester, to the fellows' great relief and satisfaction.

The preceding instances are arrayed not only in order of the magnitude of the director's intervention but also in order of fellows' satisfaction with their program and with the director's handling of problems that arose. The reader should not overlook the differences in the problems that faced the three directors in terms of the disparity in status of participants to the situation and the amount of contact between the director and the allegedly unsatisfactory teacher. We shall discuss these matters later in this chapter.

2. Requirements, Ambiguities, and Inflexible Procedures

Another rather common source of dissatisfaction in Experienced Teacher programs was the presence of vague or changing requirements and the establishment of institutional routines which made it difficult to satisfy those requirements. It was not true that the only effective programs were those whose requirements and procedures were fully and unambiguously laid down at the beginning of the year, never to change again; nevertheless, the effectiveness of many programs was greatly diminished by the fact that the fellows did not really know what would be required of them, that they were exposed to contradictory or changing requirements, or that they found the requirements nearly impossible of fulfillment.

A program in the humanities established a rather complicated set of requirements for candidates for the M.A. degree. The requirements made it possible for the fellows to choose a field of specialization in addition to the courses that the fellows took as a group. Fellows were able to select from a variety of electives those courses they would take in their specialty, subject to the restriction that they take a prescribed number of courses in some one specialty. Unhappily, the schedule of courses that would be taught in the second semester was not announced or even tentatively decided upon until December, barely a month before the second semester was to begin. Many of the elective courses were normally taught only every second or third year. Thus, when the program was a month or two old, and after their specialties had been declared, a considerable number of fellows discovered there might be no courses offered which would meet the requirements of the specialty they had selected. A failure to enroll in the required number of such courses would have meant failure to qualify for the advanced degree, making it necessary for those individuals to return to the university at some later time to make up the unsatisfied requirements. As the beginning of the second semester came nearer and there continued to be no announcement about the course schedule, the fellows became increasingly worried about completing their requirements and more and more angry at the university for placing them in such a dilemma.

The program director, sympathetic to the fellows' plight, apologized to them for the inconvenience that the delayed announcement was causing. He attributed the delay to the fact that many of the faculty members had not decided in which direction they wanted to move in the immediate future, and so were unable to specify which of several courses they would be teaching in the coming term. A tolerance for such indecisiveness, he said, is the price we must pay for the hard-won academic freedom that university professors have achieved. The director assured the fellows that he would do everything he could to see that the necessary courses were offered. However, the director was a junior member of the faculty with no obvious influence over departmental decisions. His explanations and assurances did very little to allay the anxiety of the fellows. Their reaction to the inconvenience and tension that this situation induced, interacting with their responses to several other disturbing factors, led to serious dissatisfactions with the operation of this program. Had the director been able either to bring his colleagues to an earlier decision on the courses that would be offered in the second semester or unequivocally to guarantee the fellows that their requirements would be waived if the necessary courses were not available, one major source of tension and resentment would have been eliminated.

3. The Demand for Relevance.

Still another source of resentment in some programs was the feeling that the training fellows received was irrelevant to the work they would be doing or that their course work was so unstructured or so unsupervized that it was essentially worthless. Two programs illustrate the extremes of irrelevance and relevance in the ExTFP.

> By the middle of the first semester the fellows in one program were already dissatisfied to the point of open rebellion. They had been assigned to a local school for practicum experience but the assignment apparently had been made without concern either for their own educational needs or for the school's requirement for teachers. They reported that they had been left in the school essentially without assistance, with no reasonable role to fill, with no power at all to institute the kinds of programs they thought might help the children in the school, and with no backing from the program administrators in their exchanges with the teachers and principal at the practicum school. They saw the potential for extremely rewarding practicum experiences but felt that through lack of support and organization from the program faculty and director they were not able to do most of the things that seemed valuable. They also reported that their academic courses were irrelevant either to the practicum or to their own needs and experience. The courses essentially repeated material they had taken as undergraduate students and provided substantially no stimulation. The administrators of the program revealed no awareness of the students' intense unhappiness and seemed to feel that everything was going well, although a few of the other faculty agreed with the students that the program was foundering. The students claimed they had made substantial efforts to acquaint the director with their problems and felt that he was unwilling to recognize their severity. The students were extremely angry at the director and were sorry that their complaints to the visiting team would not result in some action or some retribution on the university from the Office of Education.

> By contrast, in a program for the disadvantaged, fellows were carefully rotated through a variety of social agencies in the community, only some of which were inner-city schools, so that they could experience at first hand the life and problems of residents in the area. An important part of this practicum experience was a course taught by an experienced social worker in which they analyzed and discussed the material they observed. Simultaneously, as part of their academic program they took a series of courses in the culture and history of the various groups from which their pupils were drawn--the American Negro, the Spanish American, the American Indian, the Appalachian White. As in most institutions, fellows in this program were not without frustrations and tension; indeed,

> their practicum experiences, themselves, caused the fellows to criticize and oppose the institutions--including most of the public schools, which serve the urban slums. They extended their criticism and hostility to colleges and universities which, they felt, should have been initiators of urban reform but were collaborators in the general disregard for the inner city. Despite their general critical orientation, the fellows' level of satisfaction with their ExTFP program was high. More importantly, their training was directly relevant to the problems they would encounter as teachers in inner-city schools; at the same time, it helped them achieve a broad, general perspective on the cultural backgrounds of their pupils, in terms of which they could understand the more general problem of education for disadvantaged groups in American society.

4. The Insistence upon Action

In some respects ExTFP fellows took a different stance toward the faculty and staff of their programs than is typically adopted by undergraduate and graduate students. The fellows were experienced not only in the subject matter of their program and in the art of teaching but also in the ways of academic administration. When their programs were faced with serious problems, they cherished the hope that something would be done and that their views would be taken into account when action was taken. ExTFP fellows tended to be relatively unimpressed by a program director's words or his national reputation; they were more interested in how he behaved in the present and with respect to their program. One director, who had become rather well known nationally because of a very effective ExTFP program he had conducted the preceding year, found his fellows complaining about the amount of time he spent away from the university. He was taken aback at one conference of educators to receive a long-distance telephone call from one of his ExTFP fellows reporting that an inter-group conflict had broken out in their program which he must fly back to mediate lest the program fall apart over the week end.

If the foregoing examples suggest that the fellows in some programs were continuous'v complaining about their problems or that the most common activitiy of some program directors was holding the hands of anxious and dissatisfied fellows, let it be clear that such was not the case. We have remarked in Chapter 11 that fellows were usually reluctant to bring problems to the attention of the faculty and director until they were intense and strongly felt. At such times, however, they were likely to expect that effective action would be taken to resolve those problems. On the other side of the desk, effective program directors were not necessarily conciliatory toward their fellows, but only fair; they did not all actively seek out problems and concerns among the fellows in their program, but they tried to work out those problems that did come to their attention in such a way that all of the parties to the controversy would be satisfied with the outcome, but with the welfare and interests of the fellows primarily in mind.

The presence of overt disagreement, even occasional conflict, was not necessarily indicative of an ineffective program. At least one program director operated on the assumption that periodic clashes of contradictory views, with their attendant emotional upsets, were essential to true progress, that real growth and understanding were not likely to occur without arguments and disputes which might sometimes become intense. The program appears to have been quite successful. It should be noted, however, that this director and his faculty members managed to display a continuing respect for the opinions of the fellows and a willingness to entertain divergent views without belittling or rejecting them. Thus, an atmosphere developed in which fellows and staff maintained a continuing, cooperative orientation toward a common goal, no matter how strongly individuals might sometimes disagree with each other.[1]

In short, ExTFP fellows did not demand an educational experience that ran smoothly from beginning to end, nor even one from which disagreement and conflict were totally eliminated. They hoped for stimulating, challenging courses which were relevant to their past and future responsibilities, for requirements that were reasonable and manageable, and for an educational milieu which was congenial to the accomplishment of their individual and collective goals. Only when one circumstance or another placed the achievement of those goals in grave jeopardy did they appeal to the faculty or director for assistance. The evidence is clear that those directors who responded to such appeals with intelligent, effective action were associated with the most effective programs.

What was required in the ideal director was someone with an inclusive knowledge of the overall goals of the program and of the means that were most likely to accomplish those goals; someone who could recognized threats to the achievement of one goal or another, and who had the tact, resourcefulness, willingness, and persistence to alter those conditions before they interfered remarkably with the program's effectiveness.

These characteristics--tact, resourcefulness, and persistence--are individual qualities. It would be easy to conclude that many or most of the ineffective programs failed because those qualities were not strong enough components of their directors' personalities. But let us reserve to the institutions themselves a substantial share of the blame for faulted programs. In many universities the ExTFP director was placed in a nearly untenable position. Only the most fearless assistant professor will aggressively and persistently urge his departmental seniors to change the program's requirements so as to relieve the pressure on a group of graduate students. Even if he were to try vigorously to introduce effective changes into departmental policies, the chances that a junior faculty member would be successful are rather small; the likelihood that his vigorous actions would brighten his prospects for advancement within the department is smaller still. In the same way, an associate professor cannot easily inform a full professor, his departmental senior, that students are complaining about the content of his classes or the quality of his teaching. Even a full professor in a School of Education has little or no influence over a faculty member in Arts and Sciences, and vice versa. When a problem calls for action that is more extreme than a man of the director's status would ordinarily be expected to take, the typical faculty member, however clear his vision and noble his motives, will be reluctant to take that action. In short, when the activities of a diverse set of people are supposed to be coordinated so as to produce a unified educational program, a person who would resolve their divergent interests must have a degree of institutional power and personal influence that is commensurate to the strength of the actions he is required to take. Thus, if a faculty and administration places a junior staff member in a position of administrative responsibility without providing him with official support to carry out the kinds of actions that may be demanded by a difficult situation, that instititution has only itself to blame if the director takes no action and the program's success is diminished by his inaction.

---

[1] We should probably add that in another educational program we know about--where the director had the same commitment to confrontation but did not simultaneously adopt an open and accepting orientation toward the students--there developed an unremitting conflict between the administrator and a cohesive, hostile, unproductive group of students.

Some General Implications for Graduate and Undergraduate Education

In every institution the ExTFP had a very special administrative arrangement. From 15 to 25 fellows, with similar interests and backgrounds, were involved in a program that had been specially designed to accomplish the maximum level of achievement in some field of study in a minimum amount of time. The directors of these programs were specialists in their fields. As experts, the directors could evaluate fellows' reactions to the program, point out real relevancies that underlay apparent irrelevancies in their courses, counsel fellows about how to approach their work professionally, and work as professional equals with other staff members in revising or modifying the operation of the program when it seemed sensible to make changes. There is little wonder that, in the majority of institutions, the program produced an extremely effective educational experience.

The typical graduate program in most fields of study offers an interesting contrast to the ExTFP. Even in institutions where both programs were available, the regular graduate students were treated much differently from the Experienced Teacher fellows. There were usually many more students in the graduate program than in the ExTFP, their interests and backgrounds were less homogeneous, they were pursuing a wider variety of specialties by quite diverse routes, and there was no single faculty member who was concerned to counsel and assist the graduate students or who knew about their educational progress in anything like the detail of most ExTFP directors. The case of the undergraduate students differs even more remarkably from the situation of the Experienced Teacher fellows; the diversity in students' backgrounds, goals, and interests and the diffuseness of responsibility for advising and helping them is much greater even than for graduate students. How is it possible, then, that the Experienced Teacher Program, being so different from the norm of both graduate and undergraduate education, might have anything to say about how the more typical programs should be run?

We think, in fact, that the experience of the ExTFP has a great many implications for the organization of graduate and undergraduate education in years to come. The nature of complaints by graduate and undergraduate students are as similar to those of Experienced Teacher fellows as the organization of their programs is dissimilar: courses are poorly taught, by professors who come to class unprepared or who seem to be uninterested in their students; the program is organized in such a way that the requirements are either unclear or overly difficult to fulfill; required courses are not offered often enough or at the proper time; much of the program is irrelevant to the students' interests or to their future work; above all, there seems to be little interest among the faculty in changing courses, requirements, or methods of procedure so as to make the student's work more challenging and his life more tolerable. The massive and persistent expressions of discontent in recent years by students throughout the country have focused attention upon the depths of these dissatisfactions.

What was often available in the ExTFP and frequently is not available in most graduate and undergraduate programs was some mechanism for dealing with student dissatisfactions. As the individual who made the mechanism work, the program director could play a crucial role in the effective operation of the program. It seems clear to us that there must be instituted some similar mechanisms in graduate and undergraduate programs, as well; some clearly recognized means by which student reactions may be channeled effectively to the faculty and administration, student complaints clarified, sorted out, and discussed intelligently; and some procedure for taking systematic action to modify those courses, requirements, and methods of procedure which stand in the way of effective education.

There is increasing evidence that colleges and universities are moving to develop such mechanisms by introducing formal grievance procedures for student complaints and by establishing student representation on policy-making committees and governing boards. It would be foolish to believe that changes such as these, involving increased student participation in deciding the content and conduct of academic life, will proceed smoothly, without inducing other stresses in the university community. For one thing, the presence of student representatives on decision-making committees will not, of itself, bring about greater involvement of the average student in university life; in addition, ways must be found by which the student can communicate to and influence his representative. It will not be easy to establish such patterns of communication in a university of ten thousand students or more, especially when each student enters with little understanding of how the university operates and then leaves the system almost as soon as he has come to understand its structure. Beyond this, student demands for substantially increased interaction with faculty members amount to an insistence that faculty schedules be revised so as to give more time to students; this, in turn, threatens to reduce the time that is available to a faculty member for research and scholarship. The establishment of a community of scholars is a central value of every first-rate university; the opportunity to carry out scholarly work is one of the principal rewards of an academic career. Thus, there appears to be a degree of natural conflict between the legitimate student demands for greater involvement with the faculty and legitimate faculty demands for time to pursue individual scholarly interests.

Doubtless, other difficulties will arise, in addition to these, as changes in the traditional patterns of organization and procedure reverberate through colleges and universities. Hopefully these difficulties may be resolved or minimized in the process of increased communication and joint decision-making among faculty, students, and administrators. In any event, the lesson of the ExTFP seems to be that student satisfaction will increase as legitimate student complaints are recognized and as actions are taken to eliminate the sources of their dissatisfaction.